arXiv:0809.5190v1 [math.AP] 30 Sep 2008

Anisotropic Navier-Stokes equations in a bounded cylindrical domain

Marius Paicu and Geneviève Raugel

Univ Paris-Sud and CNRS, Laboratoire de Mathématiques d'Orsay, Orsay Cedex, F-91405, FRANCE

1 Introduction

Navier-Stokes equations with anisotropic viscosity are classical in geophysical fluid dynamics. Instead of choosing a classical viscosity $-\nu(\partial_1^2 + \partial_2^2 + \partial_3^2)$ in the case of three-dimensional fluids, meteorologists often modelize turbulent flows by putting a viscosity of the form $-\nu_h(\partial_1^2 + \partial_2^2) - \nu_v \partial_3^2$, where ν_v is usually much smaller than ν_h and thus can be neglected (see Chapter 4 of the book of Pedlovsky [14] for a detailed discussion).
More precisely, in geophysical fluids, the rotation of the earth plays a primordial role. This Coriolis force introduces a penalized skew-symmetric term $\varepsilon^{-1} u \times e_3$ into the equations, where $\varepsilon > 0$ is the Rossby number and $e_3 = (0, 0, 1)$ is the unit vertical vector. This leads to an asymmetry between the horizontal and vertical motions. By the Taylor-Proudman theorem (see [14] and [16]), the fluid tends to have a two-dimensional behavior, far from the boundary of the domain. When the fluid evolves between two parallel plates with homogeneous Dirichlet boundary conditions, Ekman boundary layers of the form $U_{BL}(x_1, x_2, \varepsilon^{-1} x_3)$ appear near the boundary. In order to compensate the term $\varepsilon^{-1} U_{BL} \times e_3$ by the term $-\nu_v \partial_3^2 U_{BL}$, we need to impose that $\nu_v = \beta\varepsilon$, for $\beta > 0$ (see [6] and also [2]).

When the fluid occupies the whole space, the Navier-Stokes equations with vanishing or small vertical viscosity are as follows

$$\begin{aligned}
&\partial_t u + u\nabla u - \nu_h(\partial_1^2 + \partial_2^2)u - \nu_v \partial_3^2 u = -\nabla p \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^3 \ , \quad t > 0 \\
&\operatorname{div} u = 0 \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^3 \ , \quad t > 0 \\
&u|_{t=0} = u_0,
\end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

where $\nu_h > 0$ and $\nu_v \geq 0$ represent the horizontal and vertical viscosities and, where $u = (u_1, u_2, u_3)$ and p are the vector field of the velocities and the pressure respectively. In the case of vanishing vertical viscosity, the classical theory of the Navier-Stokes equations does not apply and new difficulties arise. Some partial L^2-energy estimates still hold for System (1), but they do not allow to pass to the limit and to obtain a weak solution like in the well-known construction of weak Leray solutions. One cannot either directly use the results of Fujita and Kato on the existence of strong solutions. Of course, neglecting the horizontal viscosity and requiring a lot of regularity on the initial data, one can prove the local existence of strong solutions by working in the frame of hyperbolic symmetric systems. Thus, new methods have to be developed.

In the case $\nu_v = 0$, this system has been first studied by Chemin, Desjardins Gallagher and Grenier in [1], who showed local and global existence of solutions in anisotropic Sobolev spaces which take into account this anisotropy. More precisely, for $s \geq 0$, let us introduce the anisotropic Sobolev spaces,

$$H^{0,s} = \{u \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)^3 \mid \|u\|^2_{H^{0,s}} = \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} (1 + |\xi_3|^2)^s |\widehat{u}(\xi)|^2 d\xi < +\infty\}$$

and $H^{1,s} = \{u \in H^{0,s} \mid \partial_i u \in H^{0,s}\,,\, i = 1, 2\}$ (such anisotropic spaces have been introduced in [7] for the study of the Navier-Stokes system in thin domains).

In [1], the authors showed that, for any $s_0 > 1/2$, and any $u_0 \in H^{0,s_0}$, there exist $T > 0$ and a local solution $u \in L^\infty((0,T), H^{0,s_0}) \cap L^2((0,T), H^{1,s_0})$ of the anisotropic Navier-Stokes equations (1). If $\|u_0\|_{H^{0,s_0}} \leq c\nu_h$, where $c > 0$ is a small constant, then the solution is global in time. In the same paper, the authors proved that there exists at most one solution $u(t)$ of the equations (1) in the space $L^\infty((0,T), H^{0,s}) \cap L^2((0,T), H^{1,s})$ for $s > 3/2$. In these results, there was a gap between the regularity required for the existence of solutions and the one required for the uniqueness. This gap was filled by Iftimie ([8]) who showed the uniqueness of the solution in the space $L^\infty((0,T), H^{0,s}) \cap L^2((0,T), H^{1,s})$ for $s > 1/2$.

Like the classical Navier-Stokes equations, the system (1) on the whole space $\mathbb{R}^3$ has a scaling. Indeed, if u is a solution of the equations (1) on a time interval $[0,T]$ with initial data u_0, then $u_\mu(t,x) = \mu u(\mu^2 t, \mu x)$ is also a solution of (1) on the time interval $[0, \mu^{-2}T]$, with initial data $\mu u_0(\mu x)$. This was one of the motivations of Paicu for considering initial data in the scaling invariant Besov space $\mathcal{B}^{0,1/2}$. In [13], Paicu proved the local existence and uniqueness of the solutions of (1), for initial data $u_0 \in \mathcal{B}^{0,1/2}$. He showed global existence of the solution when the initial data in $\mathcal{B}^{0,1/2}$ are small, compared to the horizontal viscosity ν_h (for further details, see [11, 12, 13]). Very recently, in [3], Chemin and Zhang introduced the scaling invariant Besov-Sobolev spaces $\mathcal{B}_4^{-1/2,1/2}$ and showed existence of global solutions when the initial data u_0 in $\mathcal{B}_4^{-1/2,1/2}$ are small compared to the horizontal viscosity ν_h. This result implies global wellposedness of (1) with high oscillatory initial data.

Notice that, in all the above results as well as in this paper, one of the key observations is that, in the various essential energy estimates, the partial derivative ∂_3 appears only when applied to the component u_3 in terms like $u_3 \partial_3 u_3$. Even if there is no vertical viscosity and thus no smoothing in the vertical variable, the divergence-free condition implies that $\partial_3 u_3$ is regular enough to get good estimates of the nonlinear term.

Considering the anisotropic Navier-Stokes equations on the whole space $\mathbb{R}^3$ (or on the torus $\mathbf{T}^3$) instead of on a bounded domain with boundary leads to some simplifications. For example, the Stokes operator coincides with the operator $-\Delta$ on the space of smooth divergence-free vectors fields. Also one can use Fourier transforms and the Littlewood-Paley theory.
One of the few papers considering the anisotropic Navier-Stokes equations on a domain with a boundary is the article of Iftimie and Planas [9], who studied the anisotropic equations (1) on a half-space $\mathcal{H}$, supplemented with the boundary condition

$$u_3 = 0 \;\text{ in } \partial\mathcal{H}\;, \quad t > 0. \tag{2}$$

This system of equations can be reduced to the case of the whole space $\mathbb{R}^3$. Indeed, let w be a solution of the anisotropic Navier-Stokes equations on the half-space $\mathcal{H}$. Extending the components w_1 and w_2 to $\mathbb{R}^3$ by an even reflection and the third component w_3 by an odd reflection with respect to the plane $x_3 = 0$, we obtain a vector field $\tilde{w}$, which is a solution of the equations (1) on the whole space $\mathbb{R}^3$. Conversely, if $u(t)$ is a solution of the anisotropic Navier-Stokes equations on the whole space $\mathbb{R}^3$ with initial data $u_0 \in H^{0,1}$ satisfying the condition $u_{0,3} = 0$ on $\partial\mathcal{H}$, then the restriction of $u(t)$ to $\mathcal{H}$ is a solution of the anisotropic Navier-Stokes equations on $\mathcal{H}$, satisfying the condition (2). For initial data $u_0 \in L^2(\mathcal{H})^3$, satisfying the condition $\partial_3 u_0 \in L^2(\mathcal{H})^3$, Iftimie and Planas showed that the solutions of the anisotropic Navier-Stokes equations on $\mathcal{H}$ are limits of solutions u_ε of the Navier-Stokes equations on $\mathcal{H}$ with Navier boundary conditions on the boundary $\partial\mathcal{H}$ and viscosity term $-\nu_h(\partial_1^2 + \partial_2^2)u_\varepsilon - \varepsilon\partial_3^2 u_\varepsilon$ on a time interval $(0, T_0)$, where $T_0 > 0$ is independent of ε. If the initial data u_0 are small with respect to the horizontal viscosity ν_h, they showed the convergence on the infinite time interval $(0, +\infty)$. In what follows, in our study of the anisotropic Navier-Stokes equations on a bounded domain, we are also going to introduce an auxiliary Navier-Stokes system with viscosity $-\nu_h(\partial_1^2 + \partial_2^2)u_\varepsilon - \varepsilon\partial_3^2 u_\varepsilon$ (see System (NS_ε) below), but instead of considering Navier boundary conditions in the vertical variable, we will choose periodic conditions.

In this paper, we study the global and local existence and uniqueness of solutions to the anisotropic Navier-Stokes equations on a bounded product domain of the type $Q = \Omega \times (0,1)$, where Ω is a smooth domain, with homogeneous Dirichlet boundary conditions on the lateral boundary $\partial\Omega \times (0,1)$. For sake of simplicity, we assume that Ω is a star-shaped domain. We denote $\Gamma_0 = \Omega \times \{0\}$ and $\Gamma_1 = \Omega \times \{1\}$ the top and the bottom of Q. More precisely, we consider the system of equations

$$(NS_h)\begin{cases}\partial_t u + u\nabla u - \nu_h \Delta_h u = -\nabla p \;\text{ in } Q\;, \quad t>0\\ \operatorname{div} u = 0 \;\text{ in } Q\;, \quad t>0\\ u|_{\partial\Omega\times(0,1)} = 0\;, \quad t>0\\ u_3|_{\Gamma_0\cup\Gamma_1} = 0\;, \quad t>0\\ u|_{t=0} = u_0 \in H^{0,1}(Q),\end{cases}\tag{3}$$

where the operator $\Delta_h = \partial^2_{x_1} + \partial^2_{x_2}$ denotes the horizontal Laplacian and $\nu_h > 0$ is the horizontal viscosity. Here $u \equiv (u_1,u_2,u_3) \equiv (u_h,u_3)$ is the vector field of velocities and p denotes the pressure term. To simplify the discussion, we suppose that the forcing term f vanishes (the case of a non vanishing forcing term as well as the asymptotic behaviour in time of the solutions of (NS_h) will be studied in a subsequent paper).
Since the viscosity is anisotropic, we want to solve the above system in the anisotropic functional space

$$\widetilde{H}^{0,1}(Q) = \{u \in L^2(Q)^3 \mid \operatorname{div} u = 0\,;\, \gamma_n u = 0 \text{ on } \partial Q\,;\, \partial_3 u \in L^2(Q)^3\},$$

where $\gamma_n u$ is the extension of the normal trace $u\cdot n$ to the space $H^{-1/2}(\partial Q)$. Since u belongs to $L^2(Q)^3$ and that $\operatorname{div} u = 0$, $\gamma_n u$ is well defined and belongs to $H^{-1/2}(\partial Q)$. For later use, we also introduce the space

$$H^{0,1}(\Omega\times(a,b)) = \{u \in L^2(\Omega\times(a,b))^3 \mid \operatorname{div} u = 0\,;\, \partial_3 u \in L^2(\Omega\times(a,b))^3\},$$

where $-\infty < a < b < +\infty$. Clearly, $\widetilde{H}^{0,1}(Q)$ is a closed subspace of $H^{0,1}(Q)$.

Considering a bounded domain Q with lateral Dirichlet boundary conditions instead of working with periodic boundary conditions for example introduces a new difficulty. In particular, we have to justify that these Dirichlet boundary conditions make sense. Before stating existence results of solutions $u(t)$ to the system (NS_h), we describe our strategy to solve this problem. One way for solving System (NS_h) consists in adding an artificial viscosity term $-\varepsilon\partial_3^2 u$ (where $\varepsilon > 0$) to the first equation in (NS_h) and in replacing the initial data u_0 by more regular data u_0^ε, that is, in solving the system

$$(NS_{h,\varepsilon})\begin{cases}\partial_t u + u\nabla u - \nu_h \Delta_h u - \varepsilon\partial_3^2 u = -\nabla p \;\text{ in } Q\;, \quad t>0\\ \operatorname{div} u = 0 \;\text{ in } Q\;, \quad t>0\\ u|_{\partial\Omega\times(0,1)} = 0\;, \quad t>0\\ u_3|_{\Gamma_0\cup\Gamma_1} = 0\;, \quad t>0\\ u|_{t=0} = u_0^\varepsilon\;,\end{cases}\tag{4}$$

where the initial data u_0^ε are chosen in the functional space

$$\tilde{H}^1_0(Q) = \{u \in H^1(Q)^3 \mid \operatorname{div} u = 0\,;\, u|_{\partial\Omega\times(0,1)} = 0\,;\, u_3 = 0 \text{ on } \Gamma_0\cup\Gamma_1\},$$

and are close to u_0. In what follows, we will actually consider a sequence of positive numbers ε_n converging to 0, when n goes to infinity. Thus, we will also choose a sequence of initial data $u_0^{\epsilon_n} \in \tilde{H}_0^1(Q)$ converging to u_0 in the space $\widetilde{H}^{0,1}(Q)$ when n goes to infinity. A choice of such a sequence is possible since the space $\tilde{H}_0^1(Q)$ is dense in $\widetilde{H}^{0,1}(Q)$ (see Lemma 1 in the next section). Notice that, for $\varepsilon > 0$, we need to replace u_0 by more regular initial data u_0^ϵ in order to be able to apply the Fujita-Kato theorem.

However, the system of equations $(NS_{h,\varepsilon})$ is still not a classical system. Indeed, we need to impose boundary conditions to the horizontal part $u_h(t, x_h, x_3)$ on the top $x_3 = 1$ and the bottom $x_3 = 0$ (that is on $\Gamma_0 \cup \Gamma_1$). As in [9], we could impose Navier-type boundary conditions to the horizontal part on Γ_0 and Γ_1. Here we will take another path. We will extend the velocity field u by symmetry to the domain $\tilde{Q} = \Omega \times (-1, 1)$ and then solve the equations $(NS_{h,\varepsilon})$ on the symmetrical domain $\tilde{Q}$ by imposing homogeneous Dirichlet boundary conditions on the lateral boundary and periodic conditions in the vertical variable x_3. More precisely, let u be a vector in $\tilde{H}_0^1(Q)$. We extend u to a vector $\tilde{u} \equiv \Sigma u$ on $\tilde{Q} = \Omega \times (-1, 1)$ by setting

$$\begin{aligned} (\Sigma u)_i(x_h, -x_3) \equiv \tilde{u}_i(x_h, -x_3) =& u_i(x_h, x_3), \quad i = 1, 2, \quad 0 \le x_3 \le 1 \\ (\Sigma u)_3(x_h, -x_3) = \tilde{u}_3(x_h, -x_3) =& -u_3(x_h, x_3), \quad 0 \le x_3 \le 1, \end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

and $(\Sigma u)(x_h, x_3) \equiv \tilde{u}(x_h, x_3) = u(x_h, x_3)$ for $0 \le x_3 \le 1$. We notice that the vector $\tilde{u} = \Sigma u$ belongs to the space $H^1(\tilde{Q})^3$. We introduce the functional space

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{V} \equiv H^1_{0,per}(\tilde{Q}) = \{u \in H^1(\tilde{Q})^3 \mid \operatorname{div} u = 0\,;\, u|_{\partial\Omega\times(0,1)} = 0\,; \\ u(x_h, x_3) = u(x_h, x_3 + 2)\}. \end{aligned}$$

The vector $\tilde{u} = \Sigma u$ clearly belongs to the space $H^1_{0,per}(\tilde{Q})$.
We finally consider the problem

$$(NS_\varepsilon) \begin{cases} \partial_t u_\varepsilon + u_\varepsilon \nabla u_\varepsilon - \nu_h \Delta_h u_\varepsilon - \varepsilon \partial_{x_3}^2 u_\varepsilon = -\nabla p_\varepsilon \ \text{ in } \tilde{Q}\ , \quad t > 0 \\ \operatorname{div} u_\varepsilon = 0 \ \text{ in } \tilde{Q}\ , \quad t > 0 \\ u_\varepsilon|_{\partial\Omega\times(-1,1)} = 0\ , \quad t > 0 \\ u_\varepsilon(x_h, x_3) = u_\varepsilon(x_h, x_3 + 2)\ , \quad t > 0 \\ u_\varepsilon|_{t=0} = u_{\varepsilon,0} \in H^1_{0,per}(\tilde{Q}). \end{cases} \tag{6}$$

According to the classical Fujita-Kato theorem (see [5]), for any $u_{\varepsilon,0} \in \tilde{V}$, there exists a unique local strong solution $u_\varepsilon(t) \in C^0([0, T_\varepsilon), \tilde{V})$ of the Navier-Stokes equations (NS_ε). Moreover, this solution is classical and belongs to $C^0((0, T_\varepsilon), H^2(\tilde{Q})^3) \cap C^1((0, T_\varepsilon), L^2(\tilde{Q})^3)$. If the time existence interval is bounded, that is, if $T_\varepsilon < +\infty$, then

$$\|u_\varepsilon(t)\|_{\tilde{V}} \to_{t\to T_\varepsilon^-} +\infty. \tag{7}$$

We next introduce the "symmetry map" $S : u \in \tilde{V} \mapsto Su \in \tilde{V}$ defined as follows

$$\begin{aligned}(Su)_i(x_h,-x_3) &= u_i(x_h,x_3)\ , \quad i=1,2,\\ (Su)_3(x_h,-x_3) &= -u_3(x_h,x_3).\end{aligned}$$

We remark that, if $u_\varepsilon(t) \in C^0([0,T_\varepsilon),\tilde{V})$ is a solution of the Navier-Stokes equations (NS_ε), then $Su_\varepsilon \in C^0([0,T_\varepsilon),\tilde{V})$ is a solution of the equations (NS_ε) with $Su_\varepsilon(0) = Su_{\varepsilon,0}$. If $u_{\varepsilon,0} = \Sigma u_0$, where u_0 belongs to $\widetilde{H}^1_0(Q)$, then, $Su_{\varepsilon,0} = u_{\varepsilon,0}$ and by the above uniqueness property, the solutions $Su_\varepsilon(t)$ and $u_\varepsilon(t)$ coincide. This implies in particular that $u_{\varepsilon,3}(t)$ vanishes on $\Gamma_0 \cup \Gamma_1$ for any $t \in [0,T_\varepsilon)$. Since $u_\varepsilon(t) = Su_\varepsilon(t)$ belongs to $C^0((0,T_\varepsilon),H^2(\tilde{Q}))$, this also implies that $\partial_3 u_{\varepsilon,h}$ vanishes on $\Gamma_0 \cup \Gamma_1$ for any $t \in (0,T_\varepsilon)$ and for any $\varepsilon > 0$.

In what follows, we denote by ∇_h the gradient operator in the horizontal direction, that is, the gradient with respect to the variables x_1 and x_2. To summarize, for any $u_0 \in \widetilde{H}^{0,1}(Q)$, we will construct a (unique) local (respectively global) solution $\bar{u} \in L^\infty((0,T_0),\widetilde{H}^{0,1}(Q))$, with $\nabla_h\bar{u} \in L^2((0,T_0),H^{0,1}(Q))$ (respectively $\bar{u} \in L^\infty((0,+\infty),\widetilde{H}^{0,1}(Q))$, with $\nabla_h\bar{u}$ in the space $L^2_{loc}((0,+\infty),H^{0,1}(Q)))$ by proceeding as follows. We consider a (decreasing) sequence of positive numbers ε_m converging to zero and, using Lemma 1, a sequence of initial data $u_0^m \in \widetilde{H}^1_0(Q)$ converging to u_0 in $\widetilde{H}^{0,1}(Q)$, when m goes to infinity. Then, for each m, we solve the problem (NS_{ε_m}) with initial data $u_{\varepsilon_m,0} = \Sigma u_0^m$. We thus obtain a unique local (respectively global) solution $u_{\varepsilon_m}(t) \in C^0((0,T),\tilde{V})$ of the problem (NS_{ε_m}) where $0 < T < +\infty$ (respectively $T = +\infty$). We show that this sequence $u_{\varepsilon_m}(t)$ is uniformly bounded in $L^\infty((0,T_0),H^{0,1}(\tilde{Q}))$ and that the sequence $\nabla_h u_{\varepsilon_m}(t)$ is uniformly bounded in $L^2((0,T_0),H^{0,1}(\tilde{Q}))$, where $T_0 > 0$ is independent of m (depending only on u_0). If the initial data are small enough, we show the global existence of these solutions, again with bounds in $L^\infty((0,+\infty),H^{0,1}(\tilde{Q}))$ and $L^2((0,+\infty),H^{0,1}(\tilde{Q}))$, independent of m. Using these uniform bounds, we show that the sequences $u_{\varepsilon_m}(t)$ and $\nabla_h u_{\varepsilon_m}(t)$ are Cauchy sequences in $L^\infty((0,T_0),L^2(\tilde{Q}))$ and in $L^2((0,T_0),L^2(\tilde{Q}))$ respectively, which implies the existence of the solution $\bar{u} \in L^\infty((0,T_0),\widetilde{H}^{0,1}(Q))$ of (NS_h), with $\nabla_h\bar{u} \in L^2((0,T_0),H^{0,1}(Q))$. The uniqueness of the solution $\bar{u}$ is straightforward and is proved in the same way as the Cauchy property of the sequence $u_{\varepsilon_m}(t)$.

This paper is organized as follows. In the second section, we introduce several notations and spaces. We also prove auxiliary results, which will be used in the next sections. In the third section, we show global existence results under various smallness assumptions. The fourth section is devoted to the proof of the local existence of solutions for general initial data.

2 Preliminaries and auxiliary results

In what follows, for any u in $H^{0,1}(Q)$, we will often use the notation $\mathrm{div}_h u \equiv \mathrm{div}_h u_h = \partial_1 u_1 + \partial_2 u_2$. This quantity is well defined since, by the divergence free condition, $\mathrm{div}_h u_h = -\partial_3 u_3$.

We begin this section by proving the density of $\tilde{H}_0^1(Q)$ in the space $\widetilde{H}^{0,1}(Q)$. For sake of simplicity, we assume below that Ω is star-shaped. This hypothesis allows us to give a constructive proof of the density result. This density should be true even without this additional assumption.

Lemma 1. *Let Ω be a smooth bounded domain, which is star shaped. Then the space $\tilde{H}_0^1(Q)$ is dense in the space $\widetilde{H}^{0,1}(Q)$.*

Proof. Without loss of generality, we will assume that Ω is star shaped with respect to the origin 0.
Let u be an element of $\widetilde{H}^{0,1}(Q)$. We denote by $u^*(x_h, x_3)$ the extension of $u(x_h, x_3)$ by zero on $\mathbf{R}^2 \times (0,1)$, that is,

$$\begin{aligned} u^*(x_h, x_3) =& u(x_h, x_3)\ , \quad \forall (x_h, x_3) \in \Omega \times (0,1) \\ u^*(x_h, x_3) =& 0\ , \quad \forall (x_h, x_3) \in (\mathbf{R}^2 - \Omega) \times (0,1). \end{aligned}$$

We notice that the property $\gamma_n u = 0$ on $\partial\Omega \times (0,1)$ implies that, for any $\Phi \in \mathcal{D}(\mathbf{R}^2 \times (0,1))$ with $\Phi_{|\overline{\Omega}} = \varphi$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \operatorname{div} u^*, \Phi \rangle_{\mathcal{D}',\mathcal{D}} =& - \langle u^*, \nabla \Phi \rangle_{\mathcal{D}',\mathcal{D}} = - \int_{\Omega \times (-1,1)} u \cdot \nabla \varphi \, dx_h dx_3 \\ =& \int_{\Omega \times (-1,1)} \operatorname{div} u \, \varphi \, dx_h dx_3 - \langle \gamma_n u, \varphi_{|\partial\Omega \times (0,1)} \rangle_{H^{-1/2}, H^{1/2}} \\ =& \int_{\Omega \times (-1,1)} \operatorname{div} u \, \varphi \, dx_h dx_3, \end{aligned}$$

which implies that $\operatorname{div} u^* = 0$. We also notice that u^* and $\partial_3 u^*$ belong to $L^2(\mathbf{R}^2 \times (0,1))^3$ and that thus $\operatorname{div}_h u_h^* = -\partial_3 u_3^*$ is in $L^2(\mathbf{R}^2 \times (0,1))$.
We next want to approximate the vector u^* by a vector with compact support in $\Omega \times [0,1]$. To this end, inspired by the remark 1.7 of Chapter I of [17], we introduce the vector u_λ^*, for $\lambda > 1$, defined by

$$\begin{aligned} u_{\lambda,i}^*(x_h, x_3) =& u_i^*(\lambda x_h, x_3)\ , \quad i = 1, 2, \\ u_{\lambda,3}^*(x_h, x_3) =& \lambda u_3^*(\lambda x_h, x_3)\ . \end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

We remark that u_λ^* and $\partial_3 u_\lambda^*$ belong to $L^2(\mathbf{R}^2 \times (0,1))^3$ and that $u_{\lambda,3}^*(x_h, 0) = u_{\lambda,3}^*(x_h, 1) = 0$. Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{div}_h u_\lambda^*(x_h, x_3) =& \lambda (\operatorname{div}_h u^*)(\lambda x_h, x_3)\ , \quad \partial_3 u_{\lambda,3}^*(x_h, x_3) = \lambda (\partial_3 u_3^*)(\lambda x_h, x_3)\ , \\ \operatorname{div} u_\lambda^*(x_h, x_3) =& \lambda ((\operatorname{div}_h u^*)(\lambda x_h, x_3) + \lambda (\partial_3 u_3^*)(\lambda x_h, x_3)) = 0 \end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

For any $\lambda > 1$, the support of u_λ^* is contained in $(\frac{1}{\lambda} \bar{\Omega}) \times [0,1]$ and therefore is a compact strict subset of $\Omega \times [0,1]$.

Furthermore, using the Lebesgue theorem of dominated convergence, one easily shows that u^*_λ converges to u^* and thus to u in $\widetilde{H}^{0,1}(Q)$, when λ converges to 1.

We next introduce a smooth bump function with compact support $\rho \in \mathcal{D}(\mathbf{R}^2)$ such that

$$\rho(x_h) \geq 0 \ , \quad \int_{\mathbf{R}^2} \rho(x_h) dx_h = 1.$$

For any small positive number η, we set

$$\rho_\eta(x_h) = \frac{1}{\eta^2} \rho(\frac{x_h}{\eta}).$$

It is well-known that $\rho_\eta(x_h)$ converges in the sense of distributions to the Dirac distribution $\delta_{\mathbf{R}^2}$. For any $\lambda > 1$ and any $\eta > 0$, where η is small with respect to $1 - \lambda$, we consider the vector $u^*_{\lambda,\eta}$, which is the "horizontal convolution" of u^*_λ with ρ_η, that is,

$$\begin{aligned} u^*_{\lambda,\eta}(x_h, x_3) =& (\rho_\eta \star_h u^*_\lambda)(x_h, x_3) \\ =& \int_{\mathbf{R}^2} \rho_\eta(y_h) u^*_\lambda(x_h - y_h, x_3) dy_h. \end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

Since, for any $i = 1, 2, 3$,

$$\partial_i u^*_{\lambda,\eta}(x) \equiv \partial_i(\rho_\eta \star_h u^*_\lambda)(x) = (\rho_\eta \star_h \partial_i(u^*_\lambda))(x), \tag{11}$$

it directly follows that, for any $(x_h, x_3) \in \mathbf{R}^2 \times (0, 1)$,

$$\operatorname{div} u^*_{\lambda,\eta} = \rho_\eta \star_h (\operatorname{div} u^*_\lambda) = 0. \tag{12}$$

Using the Young inequality $\|\rho_\eta \star_h f(x_h)\|_{L^2(\mathbf{R}^2)} \leq c \|\rho_\eta\|_{L^1(\mathbf{R}^2} \|f(x_h)\|_{L^2(\mathbf{R}^2)} \leq \|f(x_h)\|_{L^2(\mathbf{R}^2)}$, we can write

$$\begin{aligned} \|u^*_{\lambda,\eta}\|^2_{L^2} =& \int_0^1 (\int_{\mathbf{R}^2} |u^*_{\lambda,\eta}(x_h, x_3)|^2 dx_h) dx_3 \leq c^2 \int_0^1 (\int_{\mathbf{R}^2} |u^*_\lambda(x_h, x_3)|^2 dx_h) dx_3 \\ =& c^2 \|u^*_\lambda\|^2_{L^2}. \end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

The properties (11) and (13) also imply that

$$\|\partial_3 u^*_{\lambda,\eta}\|_{L^2} \leq c \|\partial_3 u^*_\lambda\|_{L^2}. \tag{14}$$

We remark that $u^*_{\lambda,\eta}$ is a C^∞-function in the horizontal variable. Indeed, for any integers k_1, k_2, we have

$$\frac{\partial^{k_1+k_2} u^*_{\lambda,\eta}}{\partial x_1^{k_1} \partial x_2^{k_2}}(x_h, x_3) = \int_{\mathbf{R}^2} \frac{\partial^{k_1+k_2} \rho_\eta}{\partial x_1^{k_1} \partial x_2^{k_2}}(x_h - y_h) u^*_\lambda(y_h, x_3) dy_h.$$

If $\eta > 0$ is small with respect to $\lambda - 1$, the support of $u^*_{\lambda,\eta}(x_h, x_3) = (\rho_\eta \star_h u^*_\lambda)(x_h, x_3)$ is a compact set strictly contained in $\Omega \times [0,1]$. All these properties imply in particular that $u^*_{\lambda,\eta}$ belongs to the Sobolev space $H^1(Q)$. We also check that $u^*_{\lambda,\eta}$ vanishes on $\Gamma_0 \cup \Gamma_1$. Thus, $u^*_{\lambda,\eta}$ belongs to the space $\tilde{H}^1_0(Q)$, for $\eta > 0$ small enough with respect to $\lambda - 1$.
For any fixed $\lambda > 0$, one shows, like in the classical case of convolutions in all the variables, that

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_\eta \star_h u^*_\lambda &\to_{\eta\to 0} u^*_\lambda \text{ in } L^2(Q) \\ \partial_3(\rho_\eta \star_h u^*_\lambda) &\to_{\eta\to 0} \partial_3 u^*_\lambda \text{ in } L^2(Q). \end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

A quick proof of the first property of (15) is as follows. Let $w_n \in \mathcal{D}(\bar{Q})^3$ be a sequence of smooth vectors converging to u^*_λ in $L^2(Q)^3$. Arguing as in (13), by using the Young inequality, one proves that, for any positive number δ, there exists an integer n_δ such that, for $n \geq n_\delta$, for any $\eta > 0$,

$$\|w_n - u^*_\lambda\|_{L^2} + \|\rho_\eta \star_h w_n - \rho_\eta \star_h u^*_\lambda\|_{L^2} \leq \frac{\delta}{2}.$$

It thus remains to show for instance that $\|w_{n_\delta} - \rho_\eta \star_h w_{n_\delta}\|_{L^2}$ converges to 0, as η goes to 0. Using the C^1-regularity of the vector w_{n_δ} as well as the properties of ρ_η, one easily shows that

$$(\rho_\eta \star_h w_{n_\delta})(x_h, x_3) \to_{\eta\to 0} w_{n_\delta}(x_h, x_3) \text{ a.e. } (x_h, x_3).$$

Moreover, by (13),

$$\|w_{n_\delta} - \rho_\eta \star_h w_{n_\delta}\|_{L^2} \leq (c+1)\|w_{n_\delta}\|_{L^2}.$$

These two properties imply, due to the Lebesgue theorem of dominated convergence, that $\|w_{n_\delta} - \rho_\eta \star_h w_{n_\delta}\|_{L^2}$ converges to 0, as η goes to 0, that is, there exists $\eta_0 > 0$ such that, for any $0 < \eta \leq \eta_0$,

$$\|w_{n_\delta} - \rho_\eta \star_h w_{n_\delta}\|_{L^2} \leq \frac{\delta}{2}.$$

The first property in (15) is thus proved. The second property in (15) is shown in the same way.
Let finally $\lambda_n > 1$ and $\eta_n > 0$ be two sequences converging to 1 and 0 respectively when n goes to infinity. To complete the proof of the lemma, it suffices to notice that, by a diagonal procedure, one can extract two subsequences λ_{n_k} and η_{n_k} such that $u^*_{\lambda_{n_k},\eta_{n_k}}$ converges to u^* in $\widetilde{H}^{0,1}(Q)$ as n_k goes to infinity. The lemma is thus proved.

Remark 1. We can also define spaces with higher regularity in the vertical variable. For instance, let

$$\widetilde{H}^{0,2}(Q) = \{u \in L^2(Q)^3 \,|\, \operatorname{div} u = 0\,;\, \gamma_n u = 0 \text{ on } \partial Q\,;\, \partial_3^i u \in L^2(Q)^3\,,\ i = 1, 2\}$$

and

$$\widetilde{H}_0^{0,2}(Q) = \{u \in L^2(Q)^3 \mid \operatorname{div} u = 0 \, ; \, \gamma_n u = 0 \text{ on } \partial Q \, ; \\ \partial_3 u_h = 0 \text{ on } \Gamma_0 \cup \Gamma_1 \, ; \, \partial_3^i u \in L^2(Q)^3 \, , \, i = 1, 2\}.$$

For later use, we also introduce the space

$$H^{0,2}(\Omega \times (a,b)) = \{u \in L^2(\Omega \times (a,b))^3 \mid \operatorname{div} u = 0 \, ; \\ \partial_3^i u \in L^2(\Omega \times (a,b))^3 \, , \, i = 1, 2\},$$

where $-\infty < a < b < +\infty$.
Arguing as in the proof of Lemma 1, one shows that, under the same hypothesis, $\tilde{H}_0^1(Q) \cap H^2(Q)$ is dense in $\widetilde{H}^{0,2}(Q)$ and that $\tilde{H}_0^1(Q) \cap H^2(Q) \cap \widetilde{H}_0^{0,2}(Q)$ is dense in $\widetilde{H}_0^{0,2}(Q)$

Let $1 \leq p \leq +\infty$ and $1 \leq q \leq +\infty$. We denote by $L_v^q L_h^p(\tilde{Q}) = L^q((-1,+1); L^p(\Omega))$ or simply $L_v^q L_h^p$ the space of (classes of) functions g such that $\|g\|_{L_v^q L_h^p} = \big(\int_{-1}^{+1} (\int_\Omega |g(x_h, x_3)|^p dx_h)^{q/p} dx_3\big)^{1/q}$ is finite. We point out that the order of integration is important. Of course, $L_v^q L_h^q$ is the usual space $L^q(\tilde{Q})$ and the norm $\|g\|_{L_v^q L_h^q}$ is denoted by $\|g\|_{L^q}$. Likewise we define the spaces $L_v^q L_h^p(Q) = L^q((0,+1); L^p(\Omega))$.

Lemma 2. *The following anisotropic estimates hold.*
1) For any function g in $L^2(\tilde{Q})$ (with $\nabla_h g \in L^2(\tilde{Q})$) satisfying homogeneous Dirichlet boundary conditions on the boundary $\partial\Omega \times (-1,+1)$, we have the estimate

$$\|g\|_{L_v^2(L_h^4)} \leq C_0 \|g\|_{L^2}^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\nabla_h g\|_{L^2}^{\frac{1}{2}}, \tag{16}$$

2) For any function g in $L^2(\tilde{Q})$, with $\partial_3 g \in L^2(\tilde{Q})$, we have the estimate,

$$\|g\|_{L_v^\infty(L_h^2)} \leq C_0 \Big(\|g\|_{L^2}^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\partial_3 g\|_{L^2}^{\frac{1}{2}} + \|g\|_{L^2} \Big), \tag{17}$$

where $C_0 > 1$ is a constant independent of g.

Proof. We first prove Inequality (16). Since g vanishes on the lateral boundary, using the Gagliardo-Nirenberg and the Poincaré inequalities in the horizontal variable and also the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality in the vertical variable, we obtain,

$$\begin{aligned} \|g\|_{L_v^2(L_h^4)}^2 &\leq C \int_{-1}^{+1} \big[\big(\int_\Omega |g(x_h, x_3)|^2 dx_h \big)^{1/2} \big(\int_\Omega |\nabla_h g(x_h, x_3)|^2 dx_h \big)^{1/2} \big] dx_3 \\ &\leq C_0^2 \big(\int_{-1}^{+1} \int_\Omega |g(x_h, x_3)|^2 dx_h dx_3 \big)^{1/2} \big(\int_{-1}^{+1} \int_\Omega |\nabla_h g(x_h, x_3)|^2 dx_h dx_3 \big)^{1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

To prove Inequality (17), we first apply the Agmon inequality in the vertical variable and then the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality in the horizontal variable. We get,

$$
\begin{aligned}
\sup_{x_3\in(-1,+1)} (\int_\Omega |g(x_h,x_3)|^2 dx_h)^{1/2} \leq (\int_\Omega \sup_{x_3\in(-1,+1)} |g(x_h,x_3)|^2 dx_h)^{1/2} \\
\leq C\Big(\int_\Omega \big[(\int_{-1}^{+1} |g(x_h,x_3)|^2 dx_3)^{1/2} (\int_{-1}^{+1} |\partial_3 g(x_h,x_3)|^2 dx_3)^{1/2} \\
+ \int_{-1}^{+1} |g(x_h,x_3)|^2 dx_3 \big] dx_h \Big)^{1/2} \\
\leq C_0 \Big(\|g\|_{L^2}^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\partial_3 g\|_{L^2}^{\frac{1}{2}} + \|g\|_{L^2} \Big).
\end{aligned}
$$

The previous lemma allows to estimate the term $(u\nabla u, u)_{H^{0,1}}$, which will often appear in the estimates given below. More precisely, we can prove the following lemma.

Lemma 3. *There exists a positive constant* C_1 *such that, for any smooth enough divergence-free vector field* u *and any smooth enough vector field* v*, the following estimate holds,*

$$
\begin{aligned}
|(u\nabla v, v)_{H^{0,1}}| \leq C_1 \big(\|u\|_{H^{0,1}}^{1/2} \|\nabla_h u\|_{H^{0,1}}^{1/2} \|v\|_{H^{0,1}}^{1/2} \|\nabla_h v\|_{H^{0,1}}^{3/2} \\
+ \|\nabla_h u\|_{H^{0,1}} \|v\|_{H^{0,1}} \|\nabla_h v\|_{H^{0,1}} \big).
\end{aligned}
\tag{18}
$$

Proof. The proof of this lemma is very simple. Integrating by parts and using the divergence-free condition on u, we can write

$$
\begin{aligned}
(u\nabla v, v)_{H^{0,1}} &= (\partial_3(u\nabla v), \partial_3 v) = (\partial_3 u \nabla v, \partial_3 v) \\
&= (\partial_3 u_h \nabla_h v, \partial_3 v) + (\partial_3 u_3 \partial_3 v, \partial_3 v) \\
&= (\partial_3 u_h \nabla_h v, \partial_3 v) - (\mathrm{div}\,_h u_h \partial_3 v, \partial_3 v).
\end{aligned}
\tag{19}
$$

Applying Lemma 2, we obtain the estimate,

$$
\begin{aligned}
|(\mathrm{div}\,_h u_h \partial_3 v, \partial_3 v)_{L^2}| \leq C \|\nabla_h u\|_{L^\infty_v(L^2_h)} \|\partial_3 v\|^2_{L^2_v(L^4_h)} \\
\leq C \Big(\|\nabla_h u\|_{L^2}^{1/2} \|\nabla_h \partial_3 u\|_{L^2}^{1/2} + \|\nabla_h u\|_{L^2} \Big) \|\partial_3 v\|_{L^2} \|\nabla_h \partial_3 v\|_{L^2} \\
\leq C \|\nabla_h u\|_{H^{0,1}} \|\partial_3 v\|_{L^2} \|\nabla_h \partial_3 v\|_{L^2}
\end{aligned}
\tag{20}
$$

Furthermore, using Lemma 2 once more, we get the estimate

$$
\begin{aligned}
|(\partial_3 u_h \nabla_h v, \partial_3 v)| \leq & C \|\partial_3 u\|_{L^2_v(L^4_h)} \|\nabla_h v\|_{L^\infty_v(L^2_h)} \|\partial_3 v\|_{L^2_v(L^4_h)} \\
\leq & C \|\partial_3 u\|_{L^2}^{1/2} \|\nabla_h \partial_3 u\|_{L^2}^{1/2} \|\partial_3 v\|_{L^2}^{1/2} \|\nabla_h \partial_3 v\|_{L^2}^{1/2} \\
& \times \Big(\|\nabla_h v\|_{L^2}^{1/2} \|\nabla_h \partial_3 v\|_{L^2}^{1/2} + \|\nabla_h v\|_{L^2} \Big) \\
\leq & C \|\partial_3 u\|_{L^2}^{1/2} \|\nabla_h \partial_3 u\|_{L^2}^{1/2} \|\partial_3 v\|_{L^2}^{1/2} \|\nabla_h \partial_3 v\|_{L^2}^{1/2} \|\nabla_h v\|_{H^{0,1}}.
\end{aligned}
\tag{21}
$$

The estimates (19), (20) and (21) imply the lemma.

The next proposition shows that sequences of uniformly bounded (with respect to ε_m) classical solutions of the equations (NS_{ε_m}) converge to solutions of the system (NS_h) when ε_m goes to zero. The same type of proof implies the uniqueness of the solutions of System (NS_h). In order to state the result, we introduce the space

$$H^{1,0}(\Omega \times (a,b)) = \{u \in L^2(\Omega \times (a,b))^3 \,|\, \operatorname{div} u = 0\,;\, \nabla_h u \in L^2(\Omega \times (a,b))^3\},$$

where $-\infty < a < b < +\infty$.

Proposition 1. *1) Let $u_0 \in \widetilde{H}^{0,1}(Q)$ be given. Let $\varepsilon_m > 0$ be a (decreasing) sequence converging to zero and $u_0^m \in \tilde{H}_0^1(Q)$ be a sequence of initial data converging to u_0 in $\widetilde{H}^{0,1}(Q)$, when m goes to infinity. Assume that the system (NS_{ε_m}), with initial data Σu_0^m, admits a strong solution $u_{\varepsilon_m}(t) \in C^0((0,T_0),\tilde{V})$ where T_0 does not depend on ε_m and that the sequences $u_{\varepsilon_m}(t)$ and $\nabla_h u_{\varepsilon_m}(t)$ are uniformly bounded in $L^\infty((0,T_0),H^{0,1}(\tilde{Q}))$ and in $L^2((0,T_0),H^{0,1}(\tilde{Q}))$ respectively. Then, the sequence $u_{\varepsilon_m}(t)$ converges in $L^\infty((0,T_0),L^2(\tilde{Q})^3) \cap L^2((0,T_0),H^{1,0}(\tilde{Q}))$ to a solution $u^* \in L^\infty((0,T_0),$ $H^{0,1}(\tilde{Q}))$ of the problem (NS_h), such that $\nabla_h u^*$ belongs to $L^2((0,T_0),H^{0,1}(\tilde{Q}))$. In particular, the vector field u^* belongs to $L^\infty((0,T_0),\widetilde{H}^{0,1}(Q))$.*
2) The problem (NS_h) has at most one solution u^* in $L^\infty((0,T_0),H^{0,1}(\tilde{Q}))$ with $\nabla_h u^*$ in $L^2((0,T_0),H^{0,1}(\tilde{Q}))$.

Proof. We recall that $u_{\varepsilon_m}(t) \in C^0((0,T_0),\tilde{V})$ is a classical solution of the equations

$$\begin{aligned}
&\partial_t u_{\varepsilon_m} + u_{\varepsilon_m}\nabla u_{\varepsilon_m} - \nu_h \Delta_h u_{\varepsilon_m} - \varepsilon_m \partial_{x_3}^2 u_{\varepsilon_m} = -\nabla p_{\varepsilon_m}\\
&\operatorname{div} u_{\varepsilon_m} = 0\\
&u_{\varepsilon_m}|_{t=0} = \Sigma u_0^m.
\end{aligned} \tag{22}$$

We first want to show that, under the hypotheses of the proposition, $u_{\varepsilon_m}(t)$ and $\nabla_h u_{\varepsilon_m}(t)$ are Cauchy sequences in the spaces $L^\infty((0,T_0),L^2(\tilde{Q})^3)$ and in $L^2((0,T_0),L^2(\tilde{Q})^3)$ respectively.
In order to simplify the notation in the estimates below, we will simply denote the vector u_{ε_m} by u_m. Let $m > k$. Since the sequence ε_n is decreasing, $\varepsilon_m < \varepsilon_k$. The vector $w_{m,k} = u_m - u_k$ satisfies the equation

$$\begin{aligned}
\partial_t w_{m,k} - \nu_h \Delta_h w_{m,k} - \varepsilon_k \partial_3^2 w_{m,k} =&(\varepsilon_m - \varepsilon_k)\partial_3^2 u_m - w_{m,k}\nabla u_m\\
&- u_k \nabla w_{m,k} - \nabla(p_{\varepsilon_m} - p_{\varepsilon_k}).
\end{aligned}$$

Taking the inner product in $L^2(\tilde{Q})^3$ of the previous equality with $w_{m,k}$, we obtain the equality

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{2}\partial_t \|w_{m,k}\|_{L^2}^2 + \nu_h \|\nabla_h w_{m,k}\|_{L^2}^2 + \varepsilon_k \|\partial_3 w_{m,k}\|_{L^2}^2 =&(\varepsilon_k - \varepsilon_m)(\partial_3 u_m, \partial_3 w_{m,k})_{L^2}\\
&+ B_1 + B_2,
\end{aligned} \tag{23}$$

where

$$B_1 = -(w_{m,k,h}\nabla_h u_m, w_{m,k})_{L^2}$$
$$B_2 = -(w_{m,k,3}\partial_3 u_m, w_{m,k})_{L^2}.$$

Applying the Hölder and Young inequalities and Lemma 2, we estimate B_1 as follows,

$$\begin{aligned}|B_1| \leq& \|w_{m,k,h}\|_{L^2_v(L^4_h)}\|w_{m,k}\|_{L^2_v(L^4_h)}\|\nabla_h u_m\|_{L^\infty_v(L^2_h)}\\ \leq& \|w_{m,k}\|_{L^2}\|\nabla_h w_{m,k}\|_{L^2}\big(\|\nabla_h u_m\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla_h u_m\|_{L^2}^{1/2}\|\nabla_h\partial_3 u_m\|_{L^2}^{1/2}\big)\\ \leq& \frac{\nu_h}{4}\|\nabla_h w_{m,k}\|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{4}{\nu_h}\|w_{m,k}\|_{L^2}^2\big(\|\nabla_h u_m\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\nabla_h\partial_3 u_m\|_{L^2}^2\big).\end{aligned} \tag{24}$$

Using the same arguments as above and also the fact that $\partial_3 w_{m,k,3} = -\mathrm{div}_{\,h} w_{m,k,h}$, we can bound B_2 as follows,

$$\begin{aligned}|B_2| \leq& \|\partial_3 u_m\|_{L^2_v(L^4_h)}\|w_{m,k}\|_{L^2_v(L^4_h)}\|w_{m,k,3}\|_{L^\infty_v(L^2_h)}\\ \leq& \|\partial_3 u_m\|_{L^2}^{1/2}\|\nabla_h\partial_3 u_m\|_{L^2}^{1/2}\|w_{m,k}\|_{L^2}^{1/2}\|\nabla_h w_{m,k}\|_{L^2}^{1/2}\\ &\times\big(\|w_{m,k,3}\|_{L^2} + \|w_{m,k,3}\|_{L^2}^{1/2}\|\partial_3 w_{m,k,3}\|_{L^2}^{1/2}\big)\\ \leq& \|\partial_3 u_m\|_{L^2}^{1/2}\|\nabla_h\partial_3 u_m\|_{L^2}^{1/2}\|w_{m,k}\|_{L^2}^{3/2}\|\nabla_h w_{m,k}\|_{L^2}^{1/2}\\ &+ \|\partial_3 u_m\|_{L^2}^{1/2}\|\nabla_h\partial_3 u_m\|_{L^2}^{1/2}\|w_{m,k}\|_{L^2}\|\nabla_h w_{m,k}\|_{L^2}\\ \leq& \frac{\nu_h}{4}\|\nabla_h w_{m,k}\|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{3}{2\nu_h^{1/3}}\|\partial_3 u_m\|_{L^2}^{2/3}\|\nabla_h\partial_3 u_m\|_{L^2}^{2/3}\|w_{m,k}\|_{L^2}^2\\ &+ \frac{2}{\nu_h}\|\partial_3 u_m\|_{L^2}\|\nabla_h\partial_3 u_m\|_{L^2}\|w_{m,k}\|_{L^2}^2.\end{aligned} \tag{25}$$

The estimates (23), (24), and (25) together with the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality imply that, for $t \in [0, T_0]$,

$$\begin{aligned}\partial_t\|w_{m,k}\|_{L^2}^2 &+ \nu_h\|\nabla_h w_{m,k}\|_{L^2}^2 + (\varepsilon_k + \varepsilon_m)\|\partial_3 w_{m,k}\|_{L^2}^2\\ &\leq (\varepsilon_k - \varepsilon_m)\|\partial_3 u_m\|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{4}{\nu_h}\|w_{m,k}\|_{L^2}^2\big(\|\nabla_h u_m\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\nabla_h\partial_3 u_m\|_{L^2}^2\big)\\ &\quad+ \frac{3}{2\nu_h^{1/3}}\|\partial_3 u_m\|_{L^2}^{2/3}\|\nabla_h\partial_3 u_m\|_{L^2}^{2/3}\|w_{m,k}\|_{L^2}^2\\ &\quad+ \frac{2}{\nu_h}\|\partial_3 u_m\|_{L^2}\|\nabla_h\partial_3 u_m\|_{L^2}\|w_{m,k}\|_{L^2}^2.\end{aligned} \tag{26}$$

Integrating the inequality (26) from 0 to t, and applying the Gronwall lemma, we obtain, for $0 < t \leq T_0$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|w_{m,k}(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \nu_h \int_0^t \|\nabla_h w_{m,k}(s)\|_{L^2}^2 ds + (\varepsilon_k + \varepsilon_m) \int_0^t \|\partial_3 w_{m,k}(s)\|_{L^2}^2 ds \\
&\leq \Big[(\varepsilon_k - \varepsilon_m) \int_0^{T_0} \|\partial_3 u_m(s)\|_{L^2}^2 ds + \|u_0^m - u_0^k\|_{L^2}^2\Big] \\
&\qquad \times \exp\big(\frac{c_0}{\nu_h} \int_0^{T_0} \big(\|\nabla_h u_m(s)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\nabla_h \partial_3 u_m(s)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\partial_3 u_m(s)\|_{L^2}^2\big) ds\big) \\
&\qquad \times \exp\big(\frac{c_1}{\nu_h^{1/3}} (\int_0^{T_0} \|\nabla_h \partial_3 u_m(s)\|_{L^2}^2 ds)^{1/3} (\int_0^{T_0} \|\partial_3 u_m(s)\|_{L^2} ds)^{2/3}\big),
\end{aligned} \tag{27}$$

where c_0 and c_1 are two positive constants independent of m and k.
Since the sequences $u_{\varepsilon_m}(t)$ and $\nabla_h u_{\varepsilon_m}(t)$ are uniformly bounded in $L^\infty((0,T_0), H^{0,1}(\tilde{Q}))$ and in $L^2((0,T_0), H^{0,1}(\tilde{Q}))$ respectively, the estimate (27) implies that u_{ε_m} and $\nabla_h u_{\varepsilon_m}$ are Cauchy sequences in $L^\infty((0,T_0), L^2(\tilde{Q})^3)$ and $L^2((0,T_0), L^2(\tilde{Q})^3)$ respectively. Thus u_{ε_m} converges in $L^\infty((0,T_0), L^2(\tilde{Q})^3)$ $\cap L^2((0,T_0), H^{1,0}(\tilde{Q}))$ to an element u^* in this same space. Moreover, u^* and $\nabla_h u^*$ are bounded in $L^\infty((0,T_0),\ H^{0,1}(\tilde{Q}))$ and in $L^2((0,T_0), H^{0,1}(\tilde{Q}))$ respectively. The convergence in the sense of distributions of u_{ε_m} to u^* and the divergence-free property of the sequence u_{ε_m} imply that u^* is also divergence-free. Furthermore, one easily shows that the restriction of u^* to Q is a weak solution of the system (NS_h). From the equality $\Sigma u_{\varepsilon_m}(t) = u_{\varepsilon_m}(t)$, it follows that $\Sigma u^*(t) = u^*(t)$. In particular, $u_3^*(t)$ vanishes on $\Gamma_0 \cup \Gamma_1$. Finally, we notice that, since $u_{\varepsilon_m}(t) \in C^0((0,T_0), \tilde{V})$ converges in $L^2((0,T_0), H^{1,0}(\tilde{Q}))$, $u^*(t)$ satisfies the homogeneous Dirichlet boundary condition on the lateral boundary $\partial\Omega \times (-1,1)$ for almost all $t \in (0,T_0)$.
2) One proves the uniqueness of the solution u^* in $L^\infty((0,T_0), H^{0,1}(\tilde{Q}))$ with $\nabla_h u^*$ in $L^2((0,T_0), H^{0,1}(\tilde{Q}))$ in the same way as the above Cauchy property.

We now state the classical energy estimate which will be widely used in the next sections.

Lemma 4. *Let $u_\varepsilon(t) \in C^0([0,T_0], \tilde{V})$ be the classical solution of the equations (NS_ε) with initial data $u_{\varepsilon,0} \in \tilde{V}$. Then the following estimates are satisfied, for any $t \in [0,T_0]$, for any $0 \leq t_0 \leq t$,*

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|u_\varepsilon(t)\|_{L^2}^2 \leq \|u_\varepsilon(0)\|_{L^2}^2 \exp(-2\nu_h \lambda_0^{-1} t), \\
&\nu_h \int_{t_0}^t \|\nabla_h u_\varepsilon(s)\|_{L^2}^2 ds + \varepsilon \int_{t_0}^t \|\partial_3 u_\varepsilon(s)\|_{L^2}^2 ds \leq \frac{1}{2} \|u_\varepsilon(0)\|_{L^2}^2 \exp(-2\nu_h \lambda_0^{-1} t_0),
\end{aligned} \tag{28}$$

where λ_0 is the constant coming from the Poincaré inequality.

Proof. Since $u_\varepsilon \in C^0([0,T_0], \tilde{V})$ is the classical solution of (NS_ε), we can take the inner product in $L^2(\tilde{Q})^3$ of the first equation in (NS_ε) with u_ε and integrate by parts. We thus obtain, for $0 \leq t \leq T_0$,

$$\partial_t \|u_\varepsilon(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + 2\nu_h \|\nabla_h u_\varepsilon(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + 2\varepsilon \|\partial_3 u_\varepsilon(t)\|_{L^2}^2 \leq 0. \tag{29}$$

Since u_ε satisfies homogeneous Dirichlet boundary conditions on the lateral boundary, there exists a positive constant λ_0 depending only on Ω such that,

$$\|u_\varepsilon\|_{L^2}^2 \leq \lambda_0 \|\nabla_h u_\varepsilon\|_{L^2}^2. \tag{30}$$

The inequalities (29) and (30) imply that, for $0 \leq t \leq T_0$,

$$\partial_t \|u_\varepsilon(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + 2\nu_h \lambda_0^{-1} \|u_\varepsilon(t)\|_{L^2}^2 \leq 0.$$

Integrating the previous inequality and applying Gronwall Lemma, we obtain the first inequality in (28). Integrating now the inequality (29) from t_0 to t and taking into account the first estimate in (28), we obtain obtain the second estimate of (28).

We continue this section by an auxiliary proposition, which will be used several times in the proof of global existence of solutions of the system (NS_ε).

Proposition 2. *Let* $u_\varepsilon \in C^0([0,T_0),\tilde{V})$ *be a classical solution of Problem* (NS_ε). *Let* $T_n < T_0$ *be a sequence converging to* T_0 *when* n *goes to infinity. If* $u_\varepsilon(t)$ *is uniformly bounded in* $L^\infty((0,T_n),H^{0,1}(\tilde{Q})) \cap L^2((0,T_n),H^{0,1}(\tilde{Q}))$ *and if* $\nabla_h u_\varepsilon$ *and* $\varepsilon \partial_3 u_\varepsilon$ *are uniformly bounded in* $L^2((0,T_n),H^{0,1}(\tilde{Q}))$ *as* n *goes to infinity, then* u_ε *is uniformly bounded in* $C^0([0,T_n],\tilde{V})$ *and the classical solution* u_ε *exists on a time interval* $[0,T_\varepsilon)$ *where* $T_\varepsilon > T_0$. *In particular, if* T_n *is a sequence which goes to infinity when* n *goes to infinity, then the classical solution* u_ε *exists globally.*

Proof. Let $u_\varepsilon \in C^0([0,T_0),\tilde{V})$ be a (local) classical solution of Problem (NS_ε). In order to prove the proposition, we have to show that $\nabla_h u_\varepsilon$ is uniformly bounded in $L^\infty((0,T_n),L^2(\tilde{Q})^3)$ as n goes to infinity. Since u_ε is a classical solution, all the a priori estimates made below can be justified. Let P be the classical Leray projection of $L^2(\tilde{Q})^3$ onto $\tilde{H}$, where

$$\tilde{H} = \{u \in L^2(\tilde{Q})^3 \mid \operatorname{div} u = 0\,;\, \gamma_n u|_{\partial\Omega\times(0,1)} = 0\,;\, u(x_h,x_3) = u(x_h,x_3+2)\}.$$

Taking the inner product in $L^2(\tilde{Q})$ of the first equation of (NS_ε) with $-P\Delta_h u_\varepsilon$, we obtain the equality

$$-(\partial_t u_\varepsilon, \Delta_h u_\varepsilon) + \nu_h \|P\Delta_h u_\varepsilon\|_{L^2}^2 + \varepsilon(\partial_3^2 u_\varepsilon, P\Delta_h u_\varepsilon) = -(u_\varepsilon \cdot \nabla u_\varepsilon, P\Delta_h u_\varepsilon).$$

We remark that, for $0 < t < T_0$, $\partial_t u_\varepsilon$, $\partial_3 u_\varepsilon$ and $\partial_3^2 u_\varepsilon$ vanish on the lateral boundary and are periodic in x_3. Moreover, the divergence of $\partial_3^2 u_\varepsilon$ vanishes. These properties imply on the one hand that

$$-\int_{\tilde{Q}} \partial_t u_\varepsilon \cdot \Delta_h u_\varepsilon dx = \int_{\tilde{Q}} \partial_t \nabla_h u_\varepsilon \cdot \nabla_h u_\varepsilon dx = \frac{1}{2}\partial_t \|\nabla_h u_\varepsilon\|_{L^2}^2.$$

On the other hand, we can write, for $0 < t < T_0$,

$$\int_{\tilde{Q}} \partial_3^2 u_\varepsilon \cdot P\Delta_h u_\varepsilon dx = \int_{\tilde{Q}} \partial_3^2 u_\varepsilon \cdot \Delta_h u_\varepsilon dx = -\int_{\tilde{Q}} \partial_3 u_\varepsilon \cdot \Delta_h \partial_3 u_\varepsilon dx = \|\nabla_h \partial_3 u_\varepsilon\|_{L^2}^2 .$$

The previous three equalities imply that, for $0 < t < T_0$,

$$\partial_t \|\nabla_h u_\varepsilon\|_{L^2}^2 + \nu_h \|P\Delta_h u_\varepsilon\|_{L^2}^2 + 2\varepsilon \|\nabla_h \partial_3 u_\varepsilon\|_{L^2}^2 \leq \frac{1}{\nu_h} \|u_\varepsilon \cdot \nabla u_\varepsilon\|_{L^2}^2 . \tag{31}$$

To estimate the term $\|u_\varepsilon \cdot \nabla u_\varepsilon\|_{L^2}^2$, we write

$$\begin{aligned} \|u_\varepsilon \cdot \nabla u_\varepsilon\|_{L^2}^2 &= \int_{\tilde{Q}} (u_{\varepsilon,h} \cdot \nabla_h u_\varepsilon + u_{\varepsilon,3} \cdot \partial_3 u_\varepsilon)^2 dx \\ &\leq 2\|u_{\varepsilon,h} \cdot \nabla_h u_\varepsilon\|_{L^2}^2 + 2\|u_{\varepsilon,3} \cdot \partial_3 u_\varepsilon\|_{L^2}^2 . \end{aligned} \tag{32}$$

It remains to bound both terms in the right hand side of the inequality (32). Using the Gagliardo Nirenberg and the Poincaré inequalities, we can write

$$\begin{aligned} \|u_{\varepsilon,h} \cdot \nabla_h u_\varepsilon\|_{L^2}^2 \leq & \int_{-1}^1 \|u_\varepsilon(.,x_3)\|_{L_h^4}^2 \|\nabla_h u_\varepsilon\|_{L_h^4}^2 dx_3 \\ \leq & c_0 \Big(\int_{-1}^1 \|u_\varepsilon(.,x_3)\|_{L_h^2} \|\nabla_h u_\varepsilon\|_{L_h^2}^2 \|D_h \nabla_h u_\varepsilon(.,x_3)\|_{L_h^2} dx_3 \\ & + \int_{-1}^1 \|u_\varepsilon(.,x_3)\|_{L_h^2} \|\nabla_h u_\varepsilon\|_{L_h^2}^3 dx_3 \Big) \\ \leq & c_1 \Big(\|u_\varepsilon\|_{L_v^\infty(L_h^2)} \|\nabla_h u_\varepsilon\|_{L_v^\infty(L_h^2)} \|\nabla_h u_\varepsilon\|_{L^2} \|D_h \nabla_h u_\varepsilon\|_{L^2} \\ & + \|u_\varepsilon\|_{L_v^\infty(L_h^2)} \|\nabla_h u_\varepsilon\|_{L_v^\infty(L_h^2)} \|\nabla_h u_\varepsilon\|_{L^2}^2 \Big). \end{aligned}$$

Applying now Lemma 2 to the previous inequality, we obtain,

$$\begin{aligned} \|u_{\varepsilon,h} \cdot \nabla_h u_\varepsilon\|_{L^2}^2 \leq & c_2 \Big(\|u_\varepsilon\|_{L^2} + \|\partial_3 u_\varepsilon\|_{L^2}^{1/2} \|u_\varepsilon\|_{L^2}^{1/2} \Big) \\ & \times \Big(\|\nabla_h u_\varepsilon\|_{L^2} + \|\partial_3 \nabla_h u_\varepsilon\|_{L^2}^{1/2} \|\nabla_h u_\varepsilon\|_{L^2}^{1/2} \Big) \\ & \times \Big(\|\nabla_h u_\varepsilon\|_{L^2} + \|D_h \nabla_h u_\varepsilon\|_{L^2} \Big) \|\nabla_h u_\varepsilon\|_{L^2} . \end{aligned} \tag{33}$$

The classical regularity theorem for the stationary Stokes problem (see for example [4], [15] or [17]) implies that there exists a positive constant $K_0(\varepsilon)$, which could depend on ε, such that,

$$\|D_h \nabla_h u_\varepsilon\|_{L^2} \leq K_0(\varepsilon) \big(\|P\Delta_h u_\varepsilon\|_{L^2} + \frac{\varepsilon}{\nu_h} \|\partial_3^2 u_\varepsilon\|_{L^2} \big). \tag{34}$$

Using the Young inequality $2ab \leq a^2 + b^2$, we deduce from (33) and (34) that

$$\begin{aligned}\|u_{\varepsilon,h}\cdot\nabla_h u_\varepsilon\|_{L^2}^2 \le{}& 4c_2\Big(\|u_\varepsilon\|_{L^2}+\|\partial_3 u_\varepsilon\|_{L^2}\Big)\Big(\|\nabla_h u_\varepsilon\|_{L^2}+\|\partial_3\nabla_h u_\varepsilon\|_{L^2}\Big)\\ &\times\Big(\|\nabla_h u_\varepsilon\|_{L^2}+K_0(\varepsilon)(\|P\Delta_h u_\varepsilon\|_{L^2}+\frac{\varepsilon}{\nu_h}\|\partial_3^2 u_\varepsilon\|_{L^2})\Big)\|\nabla_h u_\varepsilon\|_{L^2},\end{aligned}$$

and also

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{2}{\nu_h}\|u_{\varepsilon,h}\cdot\nabla_h u_\varepsilon\|_{L^2}^2 \le{}& \frac{\nu_h}{2}\|P\Delta_h u_\varepsilon\|_{L^2}^2+\frac{\varepsilon^2}{\nu_h}\|\partial_3^2 u_\varepsilon\|_{L^2}^2+\frac{\nu_h}{2}\|\nabla_h u_\varepsilon\|_{L^2}^2\\ &+c_5\frac{K_0(\varepsilon)^2+1}{\nu_h^3}(\|u_\varepsilon\|_{L^2}^2+\|\partial_3 u_\varepsilon\|_{L^2}^2)\\ &\times(\|\nabla_h u_\varepsilon\|_{L^2}^2+\|\partial_3\nabla_h u_\varepsilon\|_{L^2}^2)\|\nabla_h u_\varepsilon\|_{L^2}^2.\end{aligned}\tag{35}$$

Likewise, using the Gagliardo Nirenberg and the Poincaré inequalities, we can write

$$\|u_{\varepsilon,3}\cdot\partial_3 u_\varepsilon\|_{L^2}^2 \le c_1\|u_{\varepsilon,3}\|_{L_v^\infty(L_h^2)}\|\nabla_h u_{\varepsilon,3}\|_{L_v^\infty(L_h^2)}\|\partial_3 u_\varepsilon\|_{L^2}\|\nabla_h\partial_3 u_\varepsilon\|_{L^2},$$

which implies, due to Lemma 2,

$$\begin{aligned}\|u_{\varepsilon,3}\cdot\partial_3 u_\varepsilon\|_{L^2}^2 \le{}& c_2\Big(\|u_\varepsilon\|_{L^2}+\|\partial_3 u_{\varepsilon,3}\|_{L^2}^{1/2}\|u_{\varepsilon,3}\|_{L^2}^{1/2}\Big)\\ &\times\Big(\|\nabla_h u_{\varepsilon,3}\|_{L^2}+\|\partial_3\nabla_h u_{\varepsilon,3}\|_{L^2}^{1/2}\|\nabla_h u_{\varepsilon,3}\|_{L^2}^{1/2}\Big)\\ &\times\|\partial_3 u_\varepsilon\|_{L^2}\|\nabla_h\partial_3 u_\varepsilon\|_{L^2}.\end{aligned}$$

Using the Young inequalities $ab\le\frac{1}{2}a^2+\frac{1}{2}b^2$ and $ab\le\frac{1}{4}a^4+\frac{3}{4}b^{4/3}$, we deduce from the previous inequality that

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{2}{\nu_h}\|u_{\varepsilon,3}\cdot\partial_3 u_\varepsilon\|_{L^2}^2 \le{}& \frac{c_6}{\nu_h}\Big(\|u_\varepsilon\|_{L^2}+\|\partial_3 u_{\varepsilon,3}\|_{L^2}\Big)\|\partial_3 u_\varepsilon\|_{L^2}\\ &\times\big(\|\nabla_h u_{\varepsilon,3}\|_{L^2}^2+\|\partial_3\nabla_h u_{\varepsilon,3}\|_{L^2}^2\big).\end{aligned}\tag{36}$$

Finally, we deduce from the estimates (31), (35) and, (36) that, for $0\le t<T_0$,

$$\begin{aligned}\partial_t\|\nabla_h u_\varepsilon(t)\|_{L^2}^2&+\frac{\nu_h}{2}\|P\Delta_h u_\varepsilon\|_{L^2}^2\\ \le{}&\frac{\varepsilon^2}{\nu_h}\|\partial_3^2 u_\varepsilon(t)\|_{L^2}^2+\frac{\nu_h}{2}\|\nabla_h u_\varepsilon(t)\|_{L^2}^2\\ &+L_\varepsilon(u_\varepsilon(t))\big(\frac{2c_6}{\nu_h}+c_5\frac{(K_0(\varepsilon)^2+1)}{\nu_h^3}\|\nabla_h u_\varepsilon(t)\|_{L^2}^2\big),\end{aligned}\tag{37}$$

where

$$L_\varepsilon(u_\varepsilon(t))=(\|u_\varepsilon(t)\|_{L^2}^2+\|\partial_3 u_\varepsilon(t)\|_{L^2}^2)\,(\|\nabla_h u_\varepsilon(t)\|_{L^2}^2+\|\partial_3\nabla_h u_\varepsilon(t)\|_{L^2}^2).$$

Integrating the inequality (37) from 0 to T_n, where $0<T_n<T_0$, we infer from (37) that, for any T_n, with $0<T_n<T_0$,

$$\begin{aligned}\|\nabla_h u_\varepsilon(T_n)\|_{L^2}^2 &+ \frac{\nu_h}{2}\int_0^{T_n}\|P\varDelta_h u_\varepsilon(s)\|_{L^2}^2 ds \\ &\leq \int_0^{T_n}\big(\frac{\varepsilon^2}{\nu_h}\|\partial_3^2 u_\varepsilon(s)\|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{\nu_h}{2}\|\nabla_h u_\varepsilon(s)\|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{2c_6}{\nu_h}L_\varepsilon(u_\varepsilon(s))\big)ds \\ &\quad + \|\nabla_h u_\varepsilon(0)\|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{c_5(K_0(\varepsilon)^2+1)}{\nu_h^3}\int_0^{T_n} L_\varepsilon(u_\varepsilon(s))\|\nabla_h u_\varepsilon(s)\|_{L^2}^2 ds.\end{aligned} \tag{38}$$

Using Gronwall Lemma and taking into account the hypotheses made on u_ε, we deduce from (38) that, for any T_n, with $0 < T_n < T_0$,

$$\begin{aligned}\|\nabla_h u_\varepsilon(T_n)\|_{L^2}^2 \leq &\Big[\int_0^{T_n}\big(\frac{\varepsilon^2}{\nu_h}\|\partial_3^2 u_\varepsilon(s)\|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{\nu_h}{2}\|\nabla_h u_\varepsilon(s)\|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{2c_6}{\nu_h}L_\varepsilon(u_\varepsilon(s))\big)ds \\ &+ \|\nabla_h u_\varepsilon(0)\|_{L^2}^2\Big]\exp\Big(\frac{c_5(K_0(\varepsilon)^2+1)}{\nu_h^3}\int_0^{T_n} L_\varepsilon(u_\varepsilon(s))ds\Big) \\ \leq &\big[\|\nabla_h u_\varepsilon(0)\|_{L^2}^2 + k_1 + \frac{2c_6}{\nu_h}k_2\big]\exp\Big(\frac{c_5(K_0(\varepsilon)^2+1)}{\nu_h^3}k_2\Big),\end{aligned} \tag{39}$$

where k_1 and k_2 are positive constants independent of T_n (k_1 and k_2 can depend on ε). Thus the proposition is proved.

We end this section by giving an upper bound of the $H^{0,2}$-norm of the solution $u_\varepsilon(t)$ of the system (NS_ε) on any subinterval of the maximal interval of existence, when the initial data $u_{\varepsilon,0}$ belong to $\tilde{V} \cap H^2(\tilde{Q})^3$.

Proposition 3. *Let $u_\varepsilon \in C^0([0,T_0],\tilde{V})$ be a classical solution of Problem (NS_ε) with initial data $u_{\varepsilon,0}$ in $H^2(\tilde{Q})^3 \cap \tilde{V}$. We assume that $u_\varepsilon(t)$ (resp. $\nabla_h u_\varepsilon$) is uniformly bounded with respect to ε in $L^\infty((0,T_0],H^{0,1}(\tilde{Q})) \cap L^2((0,T_0],H^{0,1}(\tilde{Q}))$ (resp. in $L^2((0,T_0),H^{0,1}(\tilde{Q}))$). Then $\partial_3^2 u_\varepsilon$ (respectively $\partial_3^2\nabla_h u_\varepsilon$) is bounded in $L^\infty((0,T_0),L^2(\tilde{Q}^3))$ (respectively $L^2((0,T_0),L^2(\tilde{Q}^3))$) uniformly with respect to ε and the following estimate holds, for any $0 \leq t \leq T_0$,*

$$\begin{aligned}\|\partial_3^2 u_\varepsilon(t)\|_{L^2} &+ \nu_h\int_0^t\|\nabla_h\partial_3^2 u_\varepsilon(s)\|_{L^2}^2 ds \\ \leq &\ \big[\exp(\frac{C}{\nu_h}\int_0^{T_0}\|\nabla_h u_\varepsilon(s)\|_{H^{0,1}}^2 ds)\big]\Big(\|\partial_3^2 u_{\varepsilon,0}\|_{L^2}^2 \\ &+ \frac{C}{\nu_h}\sup_{0\leq s\leq T_0}\big(\|\partial_3 u_\varepsilon(s)\|_{L^2}^2 + \nu_h\|\partial_3 u_\varepsilon(s)\|_{L^2}\big)\int_0^{T_0}\|\nabla_h u_\varepsilon(s)\|_{H^{0,1}}^2 ds\Big).\end{aligned} \tag{40}$$

Proof. Since $u_\varepsilon(t)$ is a very regular solution for $t > 0$, all the a priori estimates made below are justified. Differentiating twice the first equation in (NS_ε) with respect to x_3 and taking the inner product in $L^2(\tilde{Q})$ of the resulting equation with $\partial_3^2 u_\varepsilon$, we obtain the following equality, for $0 \le t \le T_0$,

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{2}\partial_t \|\partial_3^2 u_\varepsilon\|_{L^2}^2 - \nu_h(\Delta_h \partial_3^2 u_\varepsilon, \partial_3^2 u_\varepsilon) - \varepsilon(\partial_3^4 u_\varepsilon, \partial_3^2 u_\varepsilon) = -(\partial_3^2 \nabla p_\varepsilon, \partial_3^2 u_\varepsilon)\\ -(\partial_3^2(u_\varepsilon \cdot \nabla u_\varepsilon), \partial_3^2 u_\varepsilon).\end{aligned}$$

Since $\partial_3^2 u_\varepsilon$ vanishes on $\partial\Omega \times (-1,1)$ and is periodic in the variable x_3, the following equalities hold:

$$\begin{aligned}-\int_{\tilde{Q}} \Delta_h \partial_3^2 u_\varepsilon \cdot \partial_3^2 u_\varepsilon dx_h dx_3 &= \int_{\tilde{Q}} |\nabla_h \partial_3^2 u_\varepsilon|^2 dx_h dx_3\\ -\int_{\tilde{Q}} \partial_3^4 u_\varepsilon \cdot \partial_3^2 u_\varepsilon dx_h dx_3 &= \int_{\tilde{Q}} (\partial_3^3 u_\varepsilon)^2 dx_h dx_3,\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}-\int_{\tilde{Q}} \nabla \partial_3^2 p_\varepsilon \partial_3^2 u_\varepsilon dx_h dx_3 =& \int_{\tilde{Q}} \partial_3^2 p_\varepsilon \operatorname{div} \partial_3^2 u_\varepsilon dx_h dx_3 - \int_{\partial\tilde{Q}} \partial_3^2 p_\varepsilon(\partial_3^2 u_\varepsilon \cdot n) d\sigma\\ =&0\ .\end{aligned}$$

We deduce from the above equalities that, for $0 \le t \le T_0$,

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{1}{2}\partial_t \|\partial_3^2 u_\varepsilon\|_{L^2}^2 + \nu_h \|\nabla_h \partial_3^2 u_\varepsilon\|_{L^2}^2 + \varepsilon \|\partial_3^3 u_\varepsilon\|_{L^2}^2\\ &\qquad = -\,(\partial_3^2 u_\varepsilon \cdot \nabla u_\varepsilon, \partial_3^2 u_\varepsilon) - 2(\partial_3 u_\varepsilon \cdot \nabla \partial_3 u_\varepsilon, \partial_3^2 u_\varepsilon).\end{aligned} \tag{41}$$

Like in the proof of Lemma 3, using the divergence-free condition (see (19)), we decompose the terms in the right hand side of (41) as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}(\partial_3^2 u_\varepsilon \cdot \nabla u_\varepsilon, \partial_3^2 u_\varepsilon) &= (\partial_3^2 u_{\varepsilon,h} \cdot \nabla_h u_\varepsilon, \partial_3^2 u_\varepsilon) - (\partial_3 \operatorname{div}_h u_{\varepsilon,h} \partial_3 u_\varepsilon, \partial_3^2 u_\varepsilon)\\ (\partial_3 u_\varepsilon \cdot \nabla \partial_3 u_\varepsilon, \partial_3^2 u_\varepsilon) &= (\partial_3 u_{\varepsilon,h} \cdot \nabla_h \partial_3 u_\varepsilon, \partial_3^2 u_\varepsilon) - (\operatorname{div}_h u_\varepsilon \partial_3^2 u_\varepsilon, \partial_3^2 u_\varepsilon).\end{aligned} \tag{42}$$

Arguing as in the inequality (21) and applying Lemma 2, we obtain the estimate

$$\begin{aligned}|(\partial_3^2 u_{\varepsilon,h} \cdot \nabla_h u_\varepsilon, \partial_3^2 u_\varepsilon)| \le& C\|\partial_3^2 u_{\varepsilon,h}\|_{L_v^2(L_h^4)}^2 \|\nabla_h u_\varepsilon\|_{L_v^\infty(L_h^2)}\\ \le& C\|\partial_3^2 u_\varepsilon\|_{L^2} \|\nabla_h \partial_3^2 u_\varepsilon\|_{L^2} \|\nabla_h u_\varepsilon\|_{H^{0,1}}\\ \le& \frac{C}{\nu_h}\|\partial_3^2 u_\varepsilon\|_{L^2}^2 \|\nabla_h u_\varepsilon\|_{H^{0,1}}^2 + \frac{\nu_h}{8}\|\nabla_h \partial_3^2 u_\varepsilon\|_{L^2}^2.\end{aligned} \tag{43}$$

In the same way, we have the estimate

$$2|(\operatorname{div}_h u_\varepsilon \partial_3^2 u_\varepsilon, \partial_3^2 u_\varepsilon)| \le \frac{C}{\nu_h}\|\partial_3^2 u_\varepsilon\|_{L^2}^2 \|\nabla_h u_\varepsilon\|_{H^{0,1}}^2 + \frac{\nu_h}{8}\|\nabla_h \partial_3^2 u_\varepsilon\|_{L^2}^2. \tag{44}$$

In order to estimate the term $|(\partial_3 \operatorname{div}_h u_{\varepsilon,h} \partial_3 u_\varepsilon, \partial_3^2 u_\varepsilon)|$, we proceed like in (20), by applying Lemma 2. We thus get,

$$\begin{aligned}|(\partial_3 \mathrm{div}\,_h u_{\varepsilon,h}\partial_3 u_\varepsilon, \partial_3^2 u_\varepsilon)| \le & C\|\partial_3 \nabla_h u_\varepsilon\|_{L^\infty_v(L^2_h)}\|\partial_3 u_\varepsilon\|_{L^2_v(L^4_h)}\|\partial_3^2 u_\varepsilon\|_{L^2_v(L^4_h)}\\ \le & C\|\partial_3 u_\varepsilon\|_{L^2}^{1/2}\|\nabla_h\partial_3 u_\varepsilon\|_{L^2}^{1/2}\|\partial_3^2 u_\varepsilon\|_{L^2}^{1/2}\|\nabla_h\partial_3^2 u_\varepsilon\|_{L^2}^{1/2}\\ & \times\left(\|\partial_3\nabla_h u_\varepsilon\|_{L^2} + \|\partial_3\nabla_h u_\varepsilon\|_{L^2}^{1/2}\|\partial_3^2\nabla_h u_\varepsilon\|_{L^2}^{1/2}\right)\\ \le & C\|\partial_3 u_\varepsilon\|_{L^2}^{1/2}\|\nabla_h\partial_3 u_\varepsilon\|_{L^2}^{3/2}\|\partial_3^2 u_\varepsilon\|_{L^2}^{1/2}\|\nabla_h\partial_3^2 u_\varepsilon\|_{L^2}^{1/2}\\ & + \|\partial_3 u_\varepsilon\|_{L^2}^{1/2}\|\nabla_h\partial_3 u_\varepsilon\|_{L^2}\|\partial_3^2 u_\varepsilon\|_{L^2}^{1/2}\|\nabla_h\partial_3^2 u_\varepsilon\|_{L^2}.\end{aligned}$$

Applying the Young inequalities $2ab \le a^2 + b^2$ and $ab \le (1/4)a^4 + (3/4)b^{4/3}$ to the previous estimates we obtain,

$$\begin{aligned}&|(\partial_3 \mathrm{div}\,_h u_{\varepsilon,h}\partial_3 u_\varepsilon, \partial_3^2 u_\varepsilon)|\\ &\qquad \le \frac{\nu_h}{8}\|\nabla_h\partial_3^2 u_\varepsilon\|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{C}{\nu_h}\|\nabla_h\partial_3 u_\varepsilon\|_{L^2}^2\|\partial_3 u_\varepsilon\|_{L^2}\|\partial_3^2 u_\varepsilon\|_{L^2}\\ &\qquad\quad + \frac{C}{\nu_h^{1/3}}\|\nabla_h\partial_3 u_\varepsilon\|_{L^2}^2\|\partial_3 u_\varepsilon\|_{L^2}^{2/3}\|\partial_3^2 u_\varepsilon\|_{L^2}^{2/3}.\end{aligned} \tag{45}$$

In the same way, we prove that

$$\begin{aligned}&2|(\partial_3 u_{\varepsilon,h}\cdot\nabla_h\partial_3 u_\varepsilon, \partial_3^2 u_\varepsilon)|\\ &\qquad \le \frac{\nu_h}{8}\|\nabla_h\partial_3^2 u_\varepsilon\|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{C}{\nu_h}\|\nabla_h\partial_3 u_\varepsilon\|_{L^2}^2\|\partial_3 u_\varepsilon\|_{L^2}\|\partial_3^2 u_\varepsilon\|_{L^2}\\ &\qquad\quad + \frac{C}{\nu_h^{1/3}}\|\nabla_h\partial_3 u_\varepsilon\|_{L^2}^2\|\partial_3 u_\varepsilon\|_{L^2}^{2/3}\|\partial_3^2 u_\varepsilon\|_{L^2}^{2/3}.\end{aligned} \tag{46}$$

The equalities (41) and (42) as well as the inequalities (43) to (46) imply that, for $0 \le t \le T_0$,

$$\begin{aligned}&\partial_t\|\partial_3^2 u_\varepsilon\|_{L^2}^2 + \nu_h\|\nabla_h\partial_3^2 u_\varepsilon\|_{L^2}^2 + 2\varepsilon\|\partial_3^3 u_\varepsilon\|_{L^2}^2\\ &\qquad \le \frac{C}{\nu_h}\|\nabla_h u_\varepsilon\|_{H^{0,1}}^2\Big(\|\partial_3^2 u_\varepsilon\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\partial_3 u_\varepsilon\|_{L^2}^2 + \nu_h\|\partial_3 u_\varepsilon\|_{L^2}\Big).\end{aligned} \tag{47}$$

Integrating the inequality (47) from 0 to t, we obtain, for $0 \le t \le T_0$,

$$\begin{aligned}&\|\partial_3^2 u_\varepsilon(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \nu_h\int_0^t\|\nabla_h\partial_3^2 u_\varepsilon(s)\|_{L^2}^2 ds + 2\varepsilon\int_0^t\|\partial_3^3 u_\varepsilon(s)\|_{L^2}^2 ds\\ &\quad \le \|\partial_3^2 u_{\varepsilon,0}\|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{C}{\nu_h}\int_0^t\|\nabla_h u_\varepsilon(s)\|_{H^{0,1}}^2\|\partial_3^2 u_\varepsilon(s)\|_{L^2}^2 ds\\ &\qquad + \frac{C}{\nu_h}\sup_{0\le s\le T_0}\left(\|\partial_3 u_\varepsilon(s)\|_{L^2}^2 + \nu_h\|\partial_3 u_\varepsilon(s)\|_{L^2}\right)\int_0^{T_0}\|\nabla_h u_\varepsilon(s)\|_{H^{0,1}}^2 ds.\end{aligned}$$

Applying the Gronwall lemma, we deduce from the previous inequality that, for $0 \le t \le T_0$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|\partial_3^2 u_\varepsilon(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \nu_h \int_0^t \|\nabla_h \partial_3^2 u_\varepsilon(s)\|_{L^2}^2 ds + 2\varepsilon \int_0^t \|\partial_3^3 u_\varepsilon(s)\|_{L^2}^2 ds \\
&\quad \leq \big[\exp(\frac{C}{\nu_h}\int_0^{T_0} \|\nabla_h u_\varepsilon(s)\|_{H^{0,1}}^2 ds)\big]\Big(\|\partial_3^2 u_{\varepsilon,0}\|_{L^2}^2 \\
&\qquad + \frac{C}{\nu_h}\sup_{0\leq s\leq T_0}\big(\|\partial_3 u_\varepsilon(s)\|_{L^2}^2 + \nu_h\|\partial_3 u_\varepsilon(s)\|_{L^2}\big)\int_0^{T_0} \|\nabla_h u_\varepsilon(s)\|_{H^{0,1}}^2 ds\Big).
\end{aligned} \tag{48}$$

The proposition is thus proved.

The propositions 1 and 3 together with Remark 1 imply the following $H^{0,2}$-propagation result.

Corollary 1. *Let* $u_0 \in \widetilde{H}^{0,1}(Q) \cap \widetilde{H}_0^{0,2}(Q)$ *be given. Let* $\varepsilon_m > 0$ *be a (decreasing) sequence converging to zero and* $u_0^m \in \tilde{H}_0^1(Q) \cap H^2(Q) \cap \widetilde{H}_0^{0,2}(Q)$ *be a sequence of initial data converging to* u_0 *in* $\widetilde{H}^{0,2}(Q)$*, when* m *goes to infinity. Assume that the system* (NS_{ε_m})*, with initial data* Σu_0^m*, has a strong solution* $u_{\varepsilon_m}(t) \in C^0((0,T_0),\widetilde{V})$ *where* T_0 *does not depend on* ε_m *and that the sequences* $u_{\varepsilon_m}(t)$ *and* $\nabla_h u_{\varepsilon_m}(t)$ *are uniformly bounded in* $L^\infty((0,T_0),H^{0,1}(\tilde{Q}))$ *and* $L^2((0,T_0),H^{0,1}(\tilde{Q}))$ *respectively. Then, the sequence* $u_{\varepsilon_m}(t)$ *converges in* $L^\infty((0,T_0),L^2(\tilde{Q})^3) \cap L^2((0,T_0),H^{1,0}(\tilde{Q}))$ *to a solution* $u^* \in L^\infty((0,T_0),\, H^{0,2}(\tilde{Q}))$ *of the problem* (NS_h)*, such that* $\nabla_h \partial_3^i u^*$ *belongs to* $L^2((0,T_0),L^2(\tilde{Q})^3)$*, for* $i = 0,1,2$*. Moreover, the solution* u^* *belongs to* $L^\infty((0,T_0),\widetilde{H}_0^{0,2}(Q))$*.*

Proof. Let $u_0 \in \widetilde{H}^{0,1}(Q) \cap \widetilde{H}_0^{0,2}(Q)$ be given. We notice that, by Remark 1, there exists a sequence $u_0^m \in \tilde{H}_0^1(Q) \cap H^2(Q) \cap \widetilde{H}_0^{0,2}(Q)$ of initial data converging to u_0 in $\widetilde{H}^{0,2}(Q)$, when m goes to infinity. Let u_0^m be such a sequence. As we have remarked in the introduction, Σu_0^m belongs to $H^2(\tilde{Q})^3$ and $\partial_3 u_{0,h}^m$ vanishes on $\Gamma_0 \cup \Gamma_1$. By Proposition 3, the classical solution u_{ε_m} of (NS_{ε_m}) is more regular in the sense that $\partial_3^2 u_{\varepsilon_m}$ (respectively $\nabla_h \partial_3^2 u_{\varepsilon_m}$) is uniformly bounded in $L^\infty((0,T_0),L^2(\tilde{Q})^3)$ (respectively in $L^2((0,T_0),L^2(\tilde{Q})^3)$. Thus the limit $\partial_3^2 u^*$ belongs to $L^\infty((0,T_0),L^2(\tilde{Q})^3)$ and $\nabla_h \partial_3^2 u^*$ belongs to $L^2((0,T_0),L^2(\tilde{Q})^3)$.

3 Global existence results for small initial data

We begin with the simplest result.

Theorem 1. *There exists a positive constant* c_0 *such that, if* u_0 *belongs to* $\widetilde{H}^{0,1}(Q)$ *and* $\|u_0\|_{H^{0,1}} \leq c_0 \nu_h$*, then the system* (NS_h) *admits a (unique) global solution* $u(t)$*, with* $u(0) = u_0$*, such that*

$$u \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}_+, \widetilde{H}^{0,1}(Q)) \qquad \textit{and} \qquad \partial_3 \nabla_h u \in L^2(\mathbb{R}_+, L^2(Q)^3).$$

Proof. According to the strategy explained in the introduction and according to Proposition 1, it is sufficient to prove that there exists a positive constant c_1 such that if $u_\varepsilon(0) = w_0$ belongs to $H^1_{0,per}(\tilde{Q})$ and satisfies

$$\|w_0\|_{H^{0,1}} \leq c_1 \nu_h,$$

then, for any $\varepsilon > 0$, the equations (NS_ε) admit a unique global solution $u_\varepsilon(t) \in C^0([0,+\infty), \tilde{V})$ with $u_\varepsilon(0) = w_0$ and moreover, u_ε and $\partial_3 \nabla_h u_\varepsilon$ are uniformly bounded (with respect to ε) in $L^\infty((0,+\infty), H^{0,1}(\tilde{Q})$ and $L^2((0,+\infty), L^2(\tilde{Q})^3)$.

Let now u_ε be the local solution of the equations (NS_ε) with $u_\varepsilon(0) = w_0$. Since u_ε is a classical solution on the maximal interval of existence, all the a priori estimates made below can be justified rigorously. Differentiating the first equation in (NS_ε) with respect to x_3 and taking the inner product in $L^2(\tilde{Q})^3$ of it with $\partial_3 u_\varepsilon$, we obtain, for $0 \leq t \leq T_\varepsilon$, where $T_\varepsilon > 0$ is the maximal time of existence,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2}\partial_t \|\partial_3 u_\varepsilon\|^2_{L^2} - \nu_h (\Delta_h \partial_3 u_\varepsilon, \partial_3 u_\varepsilon) - \varepsilon(\partial_3^3 u_\varepsilon, \partial_3 u_\varepsilon) & \\ = -(\nabla \partial_3 p_\varepsilon, \partial_3 u_\varepsilon) - (\partial_3 (u_\varepsilon \nabla u_\varepsilon), \partial_3 u_\varepsilon). & \end{aligned} \tag{49}$$

Since u_ε and hence $\partial_3 u_\varepsilon$ vanish on the lateral boundary $\partial\Omega \times (-1,1)$ and that u_ε and p_ε are periodic in the vertical variable, we have,

$$\begin{aligned} -\int_{\tilde{Q}} \Delta_h \partial_3 u_\varepsilon \cdot \partial_3 u_\varepsilon dx_h dx_3 &= \int_{\tilde{Q}} |\nabla_h \partial_3 u_\varepsilon|^2 dx_h dx_3 \\ -\int_{\tilde{Q}} \partial_3^3 u_\varepsilon \cdot \partial_3 u_\varepsilon dx_h dx_3 &= \int_{\tilde{Q}} (\partial_3^2 u_\varepsilon)^2 dx_h dx_3, \end{aligned} \tag{50}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} -\int_{\tilde{Q}} \nabla \partial_3 p_\varepsilon \partial_3 u_\varepsilon dx_h dx_3 &= \int_{\tilde{Q}} \partial_3 p_\varepsilon \mathrm{div}\, \partial_3 u_\varepsilon dx_h dx_3 - \int_{\partial\tilde{Q}} \partial_3 p_\varepsilon (\partial_3 u_\varepsilon \cdot n) d\sigma \\ &= 0\ . \end{aligned} \tag{51}$$

The equalities (49), (50), and (51) together with Lemma 3 imply that, for $0 \leq t \leq T_\varepsilon$,

$$\partial_t \|\partial_3 u_\varepsilon\|^2_{L^2} + 2\nu_h \|\nabla_h \partial_3 u_\varepsilon|\|^2_{L^2} + 2\varepsilon \|\partial_3^2 u_\varepsilon\|^2_{L^2} \leq 4C_1 \|u_\varepsilon\|_{H^{0,1}} \|\nabla_h u_\varepsilon\|^2_{H^{0,1}} \tag{52}$$

We deduce from the estimates (29) and (52) that, for $0 \leq t \leq T_\varepsilon$,

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t \big(\|u_\varepsilon\|^2_{L^2} + \|\partial_3 u_\varepsilon\|^2_{L^2}\big) + 2\nu_h \big(\|\nabla_h u_\varepsilon|\|^2_{L^2} + \|\nabla_h \partial_3 u_\varepsilon|\|^2_{L^2}\big) & \\ + 2\varepsilon \big(\|\partial_3 u_\varepsilon\|^2_{L^2} + \|\partial_3^2 u_\varepsilon\|^2_{L^2}\big) & \\ \leq 8C_1 \|u_\varepsilon\|_{H^{0,1}} \big(\|\nabla_h u_\varepsilon|\|^2_{L^2} + \|\nabla_h \partial_3 u_\varepsilon|\|^2_{L^2}\big). & \end{aligned} \tag{53}$$

Suppose now that the initial data $u_\varepsilon(0) = w_0$ are small enough in the sense that

$$\|w_0\|_{H^{0,1}} \leq \frac{\nu_h}{32C_1} \tag{54}$$

Then, by continuity, there exists a time interval $[0, \tau_\varepsilon)$ such that, for $t \in [0, \tau_\varepsilon)$, $\|u_\varepsilon(t)\|_{H^{0,1}} < \nu_h/(8C_1)$. If $\tau_\varepsilon < T_\varepsilon$, then $\|u_\varepsilon(\tau_\varepsilon)\|_{H^{0,1}} = \nu_h/(8C_1)$. Assume now that $\tau_\varepsilon < T_\varepsilon$. If t belongs to the time interval $[0, \tau_\varepsilon]$, we deduce from the inequality (53) that

$$\begin{aligned}\partial_t\big(\|u_\varepsilon\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\partial_3 u_\varepsilon\|_{L^2}^2\big) + \nu_h\big(\|\nabla_h u_\varepsilon\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\nabla_h \partial_3 u_\varepsilon\|_{L^2}^2\big) \\ + 2\varepsilon\big(\|\partial_3 u_\varepsilon\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\partial_3^2 u_\varepsilon\|_{L^2}^2\big) \leq 0.\end{aligned} \tag{55}$$

Integrating the inequality (55) from 0 to t, we obtain that, for $t \leq \tau_\varepsilon$,

$$\begin{aligned}\|u_\varepsilon(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\partial_3 u_\varepsilon(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \nu_h \int_0^t \big(\|\nabla_h u_\varepsilon(s)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\nabla_h \partial_3 u_\varepsilon(s)\|_{L^2}^2\big)ds \\ + 2\varepsilon \int_0^t \big(\|\partial_3 u_\varepsilon(s)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\partial_3^2 u_\varepsilon(s)\|_{L^2}^2\big)ds \leq \|w_0\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\partial_3 w_0\|_{L^2}^2\end{aligned} \tag{56}$$

The estimate (56) implies that, for $t \leq \tau_\varepsilon$,

$$\|u_\varepsilon(t)\|_{H^{0,1}} \leq \frac{\nu_h}{16C_1}.$$

In particular, $\|u_\varepsilon(\tau_\varepsilon)\|_{H^{0,1}} \leq \nu_h/(16C_1)$, which contradicts the definition of τ_ε. Thus $\tau_\varepsilon = T_\varepsilon$ and one deduces from (56) that, for $0 \leq t < T_\varepsilon$,

$$\begin{aligned}\|u_\varepsilon(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\partial_3 u_\varepsilon(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \nu_h \int_0^{T_\varepsilon} \big(\|\nabla_h u_\varepsilon(s)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\nabla_h \partial_3 u_\varepsilon(s)\|_{L^2}^2\big)ds \\ + 2\varepsilon \int_0^{T_\varepsilon} \big(\|\partial_3 u_\varepsilon(s)\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\partial_3^2 u_\varepsilon(s)\|_{L^2}^2\big)ds \leq \|w_0\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\partial_3 w_0\|_{L^2}^2\end{aligned} \tag{57}$$

To prove that $u_\varepsilon(t)$ exists globally, that is, that $T_\varepsilon = +\infty$, it remains to show that $\|\nabla_h u_\varepsilon(t)\|_{L^2}$ is uniformly bounded with respect to $t \in [0, T_\varepsilon)$. But this property is a direct consequence of Proposition 2. Theorem 1 is thus proved.

A more careful analysis allows to prove the following global existence result.

Theorem 2. *There exist positive constants* c_0 *and* c_0^* *such that, if* u_0 *belongs to* $\widetilde{H}^{0,1}(Q)$ *and satisfies the following smallness condition*

$$\|\partial_3 u_0\|^{\frac{1}{2}}_{L^2(\Omega)} \|u_0\|^{\frac{1}{2}}_{L^2(\Omega)} \exp(\frac{c_0 \|u_0\|^2_{L^2}}{\nu_h^2}) \leq c_0^* \nu_h,$$

then the system (NS_h) *admits a (unique) global solution* $u(t)$*, with* $u(0) = u_0$*, such that*

$$u \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}_+, \widetilde{H}^{0,1}(Q)) \qquad \textit{and} \qquad \partial_3 \nabla_h u \in L^2(\mathbb{R}_+; L^2(Q)^3).$$

Proof. Like in the proof of Theorem 1, it is sufficient to prove that there exist positive constants c_1 and c_1^* such that if $u_\varepsilon(0) = w_0$ belongs to $H^1_{0,per}(\tilde{Q})$ and satisfies

$$\|\partial_3 w_0\|^{\frac{1}{2}}_{L^2(\Omega)} \|w_0\|^{\frac{1}{2}}_{L^2(\Omega)} \exp(c_1 \frac{\|w_0\|^2_{L^2}}{\nu_h^2}) \leq c_1^* \nu_h,$$

then, for any $\varepsilon > 0$, the equations (NS_ε) admit a unique global solution $u_\varepsilon(t) \in C^0([0,+\infty), \tilde{V})$ with $u_\varepsilon(0) = w_0$ and moreover, u_ε and $\nabla_h u_\varepsilon$ are uniformly bounded (with respect to ε) in $L^\infty((0,+\infty), H^{0,1}(\tilde{Q})$ and $L^2((0,+\infty), H^{0,1}(\tilde{Q})$.

Let now u_ε be the local solution of the equations (NS_ε) with $u_\varepsilon(0) = w_0$ and let $T_\varepsilon > 0$ be the maximal time of existence. Like in the proof of Theorem 1, u_ε satisfies the equality (49). But here, in order to estimate the term $(\partial_3(u_\varepsilon \nabla u_\varepsilon), \partial_3 u_\varepsilon)$, we take into account the estimates (20) and (21), instead of directly applying Lemma 3. The equalities (49), (50), (51), (19) and, the estimates (20) and (21) imply that, for $0 \leq t < T_\varepsilon$,

$$\begin{aligned} &\partial_t \|\partial_3 u_\varepsilon\|^2_{L^2} + 2\nu_h \|\nabla_h \partial_3 u_\varepsilon|\|^2_{L^2} + 2\varepsilon \|\partial_3^2 u_\varepsilon\|^2_{L^2} \\ &\quad \leq C_2 \big(\|\nabla_h u_\varepsilon\|^{1/2}_{L^2} \|\partial_3 u_\varepsilon\|_{L^2} \|\nabla_h \partial_3 u_\varepsilon\|^{3/2}_{L^2} + \|\nabla_h u_\varepsilon\|_{L^2} \|\partial_3 u_\varepsilon\|_{L^2} \|\nabla_h \partial_3 u_\varepsilon\|_{L^2} \big). \end{aligned} \tag{58}$$

Using the Young inequalities $ab \leq \frac{3}{4} a^{\frac{4}{3}} + \frac{1}{4} b^4$ and $ab \leq \frac{1}{2} a^2 + \frac{1}{2} b^2$, we get the following estimates,

$$\begin{aligned} &C_2 \|\nabla_h u_\varepsilon\|^{1/2}_{L^2} \|\partial_3 u_\varepsilon\|_{L^2} \|\nabla_h \partial_3 u_\varepsilon\|^{3/2}_{L^2} \\ &\qquad \leq \frac{27 C_2^4}{32 \nu_h^3} \|\nabla_h u_\varepsilon\|^2_{L^2} \|\partial_3 u_\varepsilon\|^4_{L^2} + \frac{\nu_h}{2} \|\nabla_h \partial_3 u_\varepsilon\|^2_{L^2} \end{aligned} \tag{59}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} &C_2 \|\nabla_h u_\varepsilon\|_{L^2} \|\partial_3 u_\varepsilon\|_{L^2} \|\nabla_h \partial_3 u_\varepsilon\|_{L^2} \\ &\qquad \leq \frac{C_2^2}{2\nu_h} \|\nabla_h u_\varepsilon\|^2_{L^2} \|\partial_3 u_\varepsilon\|^2_{L^2} + \frac{\nu_h}{2} \|\nabla_h \partial_3 u_\varepsilon\|^2_{L^2}. \end{aligned} \tag{60}$$

From the estimates (58), (59) and (60), we deduce that, for $0 \leq t < T_\varepsilon$,

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{d}{dt} \|\partial_3 u_\varepsilon(t)\|^2_{L^2} + \nu_h \|\nabla_h \partial_3 u_\varepsilon(t)\|^2_{L^2} + 2\varepsilon \|\partial_3^2 u_\varepsilon\|^2_{L^2} \\ &\qquad \leq C_3 \Big(\frac{1}{\nu_h} \|\nabla_h u_\varepsilon\|^2_{L^2} \|\partial_3 u_\varepsilon\|^2_{L^2} + \frac{1}{\nu_h^3} \|\nabla_h u_\varepsilon\|^2_{L^2} \|\partial_3 u_\varepsilon\|^4_{L^2} \Big), \end{aligned} \tag{61}$$

where $C_3 = \max(C_2^2/2, 27C_2^4/32)$. The inequality (61) shows that, if there exists $\tau_\varepsilon < T_\varepsilon$ such that $\|\partial_3 u_\varepsilon(\tau_\varepsilon)\|_{L^2}^2$ vanishes, then $\|\partial_3 u_\varepsilon(t)\|_{L^2}^2$ is identically equal to zero for $\tau_\varepsilon \leq t < T_\varepsilon$.
On the time interval $[0, \tau_\varepsilon)$, the inequality

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt}\|\partial_3 u_\varepsilon(t)\|_{L^2}^2 \leq C_3\Big(\frac{1}{\nu_h}\|\nabla_h u_\varepsilon\|_{L^2}^2\|\partial_3 u_\varepsilon\|_{L^2}^2 \\ + \frac{1}{\nu_h^3}\|\nabla_h u_\varepsilon\|_{L^2}^2\|\partial_3 u_\varepsilon\|_{L^2}^4\Big), \end{aligned} \tag{62}$$

can be written as

$$-\frac{d}{dt}\|\partial_3 u_\varepsilon(t)\|_{L^2}^{-2} \leq \frac{C_3}{\nu_h}\|\nabla_h u_\varepsilon\|_{L^2}^2\|\partial_3 u_\varepsilon\|_{L^2}^{-2} + \frac{C_3}{\nu_h^3}\|\nabla_h u_\varepsilon\|_{L^2}^2,$$

or also

$$\begin{aligned} -\frac{d}{dt}\Big(\|\partial_3 u_\varepsilon\|_{L^2}^{-2}\exp(\frac{C_3}{\nu_h}\int_0^t \|\nabla_h u_\varepsilon(s)\|_{L^2}^2 ds)\Big) \\ \leq \frac{C_3}{\nu_h^3}\|\nabla_h u_\varepsilon(t)\|_{L^2}^2 \exp(\frac{C_3}{\nu_h}\int_0^t \|\nabla_h u_\varepsilon(s)\|_{L^2}^2 ds). \end{aligned}$$

Integrating this inequality from 0 to t, we obtain, for $0 \leq t < \tau_\varepsilon$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\partial_3 w_0\|_{L^2}^{-2} - \|\partial_3 u_\varepsilon(t)\|_{L^2}^{-2}\exp(\frac{C_3}{\nu_h}\int_0^t \|\nabla_h u_\varepsilon(s)\|_{L^2}^2 ds) \\ \leq \frac{C_3}{\nu_h^3}\int_0^t \|\nabla_h u_\varepsilon(s)\|_{L^2}^2 ds \times \exp(\frac{C_3}{\nu_h}\int_0^t \|\nabla_h u_\varepsilon(s)\|_{L^2}^2 ds). \end{aligned} \tag{63}$$

The second energy estimate in Lemma 4 and the inequality (63) imply that, for $0 \leq t < \tau_\varepsilon$,

$$\|\partial_3 w_0\|_{L^2}^{-2} - \frac{C_3}{\nu_h^4}\|w_0\|_{L^2}^2 \exp(\frac{C_3\|w_0\|_{L^2}^2}{\nu_h^2}) \leq \|\partial_3 u_\varepsilon(t)\|_{L^2}^{-2}\exp(\frac{C_3\|w_0\|_{L^2}^2}{\nu_h^2}). \tag{64}$$

Thus, if we assume that,

$$\|\partial_3 w_0\|_{L^2}^{-2} - \frac{C_3\|w_0\|_{L^2}^2}{\nu_h^4}\exp(\frac{C_3\|w_0\|_{L^2}^2}{\nu_h^2}) > 0,$$

that is,

$$\|\partial_3 w_0\|_{L^2}^{1/2}\|w_0\|_{L^2}^{1/2}\exp(\frac{C_3\|w_0\|_{L^2}^2}{4\nu_h^2}) < C_3^{-1/4}\nu_h, \tag{65}$$

then, we get the following uniform bound, for $0 \leq t < \tau_\varepsilon$,

$$\|\partial_3 u_\varepsilon(t)\|_{L^2}^2 \leq \exp(\frac{C_3\|w_0\|_{L^2}^2}{\nu_h^2})\Big(\|\partial_3 w_0\|_{L^2}^{-2} - \frac{C_3}{\nu_h^4}\|w_0\|_{L^2}^2 \exp(\frac{C_3\|w_0\|_{L^2}^2}{\nu_h^2})\Big)^{-1}. \tag{66}$$

Let us denote B_0 the right-hand side term of the inequality (66). Integrating the estimate (61) from 0 to t and taking into account the second energy estimate in Lemma 4 as well as the estimate (66) and the definition of τ_ε, we at once obtain the following inequality, for any $0 \leq t < T_\varepsilon$,

$$\begin{aligned}\nu_h \int_0^t \|\nabla_h \partial_3 u_\varepsilon(s)\|_{L^2}^2 ds + 2\varepsilon \int_0^t \|\partial_3^2 u_\varepsilon(s)\|_{L^2}^2 ds \\ \leq \frac{C_3}{\nu_h} B_0^2\big(1 + \frac{1}{\nu_h^2} B_0^2\big) \int_0^t \|\nabla_h u_\varepsilon(s)\|_{L^2}^2 ds \\ \leq \frac{C_3}{2\nu_h^2} B_0^2\big(1 + \frac{1}{\nu_h^2} B_0^2\big)\|w_0\|_{L^2}^2\end{aligned} \tag{67}$$

To prove that $u_\varepsilon(t)$ exists globally, that is, that $T_\varepsilon = +\infty$, it remains to show that $\|\nabla_h u_\varepsilon(t)\|_{L^2}$ is uniformly bounded with respect to $t \in [0, T_\varepsilon)$. Like in the proof of Theorem 1, this property is a direct consequence of Proposition 2. Theorem 2 is thus proved.

Remark 2. The previous theorem allows to take large initial data in the following sense. For example, we can take $u_0 \in \widetilde{H}^{0,1}(Q)$ such that,

$$\|u_0\|_{L^2(Q)} \leq C\eta^\alpha$$

and

$$\|\partial_3 u_0\|_{L^2(Q)} \leq C\eta^{-\alpha},$$

where η is a small positive constant going to 0 and $C > 0$ is an appropriate positive constant

Remark 3. Let us come back to the inequality (62). If we set

$$y(t) = \frac{\nu_h}{2} + \frac{1}{\nu_h}\|\partial_3 u_\varepsilon(t)\|_{L^2}^2 \ , \quad g(t) = \frac{C_3}{\nu_h}\|\nabla_h u_\varepsilon(t)\|_{L^2}^2 \ ,$$

the inequality (62) becomes, for $0 \leq t < \tau_\varepsilon$,

$$\frac{dy}{dt}(t) \leq g(t)\, y^2(t).$$

Integrating this inequality from 0 to t, for $0 \leq t < \tau_\varepsilon$, we get

$$-\frac{1}{y(t)} + \frac{1}{y(0)} \leq \int_0^t g(s) ds,$$

or also,

$$y(t) \leq \frac{y(0)}{1 - y(0)\int_0^t g(s)ds},$$

as long as $1 - y(0)\int_0^t g(s)ds > 0$. The previous estimate also writes

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\nu_h}{2} + \frac{1}{\nu_h}\|\partial_3 u_\varepsilon(t)\|_{L^2}^2 \leq \Big(\frac{\nu_h}{2} + \frac{1}{\nu_h}\|\partial_3 u_\varepsilon(0)\|_{L^2}^2\Big) \\ \times\Big(1 - \frac{C_3}{\nu_h}\int_0^t \|\nabla_h u_\varepsilon(s)\|_{L^2}^2 ds\big(\frac{\nu_h}{2} + \frac{1}{\nu_h}\|\partial_3 u_\varepsilon(0)\|_{L^2}^2\big)\Big)^{-1}\end{aligned} \tag{68}$$

Inequality (68) and Lemma 4 imply that

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\nu_h}{2} + \frac{1}{\nu_h}\|\partial_3 u_\varepsilon(t)\|_{L^2}^2 \leq \Big(\frac{\nu_h}{2} + \frac{1}{\nu_h}\|\partial_3 u_\varepsilon(0)\|_{L^2}^2\Big) \\ \times\Big(1 - \frac{C_3}{2\nu_h^2}\|u_\varepsilon(0)\|_{L^2}^2\big(\frac{\nu_h}{2} + \frac{1}{\nu_h}\|\partial_3 u_\varepsilon(0)\|_{L^2}^2\big)\Big)^{-1}\end{aligned} \tag{69}$$

Thus, if

$$C_3\|u_\varepsilon(0)\|_{L^2}^2\big(\frac{\nu_h}{2} + \frac{1}{\nu_h}\|\partial_3 u_\varepsilon(0)\|_{L^2}^2\big) \leq \nu_h^2, \tag{70}$$

we obtain the following uniform bound, for $0 \leq t < \tau_\varepsilon$,

$$\frac{\nu_h}{2} + \frac{1}{\nu_h}\|\partial_3 u_\varepsilon(t)\|_{L^2}^2 \leq 2\Big(\frac{\nu_h}{2} + \frac{1}{\nu_h}\|\partial_3 u_\varepsilon(0)\|_{L^2}^2\Big). \tag{71}$$

Like in the proof of Theorem 2, we deduce that, under the condition (70), the solution $u_\varepsilon(t)$ exists globally.

Theorems 1 and 2 together with Corollary 1 at once imply the following result of propagation of regularity.

Corollary 2. *Under the hypotheses of Theorem 1 or 2, if moreover the initial data* u_0 *belong to* $\widetilde{H}_0^{0,2}(Q)$*, then the solution* u *of System* (NS_h) *with* $u(0) = u_0$ *belongs to* $L^\infty(\mathbb{R}_+, \widetilde{H}_0^{0,2}(Q))$ *and* $\partial_3^2\nabla_h u$ *belongs to* $L^2(\mathbb{R}_+, L^2(Q)^3)$.

4 The case of general initial data

In this section, we want to prove the local existence of the solution $u(t)$ of the equations (NS_h), when the initial data are not necessarily small.

Theorem 3. *Let* U_0 *be given in* $\widetilde{H}^{0,1}(Q)$*. There exist a positive time* T_0 *and a positive constant* η *such that, if* u_0 *belongs to* $\widetilde{H}^{0,1}(Q)$ *and* $\|U_0 - u_0\|_{H^{0,1}} \leq \eta$*, then the system* (NS_h) *admits a (unique) strong solution* $u(t)$*, with* $u(0) = u_0$*, such that*

$$u \in L^\infty((0,T_0), \widetilde{H}^{0,1}(Q)) \qquad \textit{and} \qquad \partial_3\nabla_h u \in L^2((0,T_0), L^2(Q)^3).$$

Proof. According to the strategy explained in the introduction and according to Proposition 1, it is sufficient to prove that there exist positive constants η and T_0 such that, if $u_\varepsilon(0) = v_0$ belongs to $H^1_{0,per}(\tilde{Q})$ and satisfies

$$\|v_0 - \Sigma U_0\|_{H^{0,1}(\tilde{Q})} \leq \eta, \tag{72}$$

then, for any $\varepsilon > 0$ small enough, the equations (NS_ε) admit a unique (local) solution $u_\varepsilon(t) \in C^0([0,T_0],\tilde{V})$ with $u_\varepsilon(0) = v_0$ and moreover, u_ε and $\partial_3 \nabla_h u_\varepsilon$ are uniformly bounded (with respect to ε) in $L^\infty((0,T_0), H^{0,1}(\tilde{Q}))$ and $L^2((0,T_0), L^2(\tilde{Q})^3)$.
Let $u_\varepsilon(t)$ be the strong solution of the equations (NS_ε) with initial data $u_\varepsilon(0) = v_0 \in H^1_{0,per}(\tilde{Q})$ satisfying the condition (72). Let $T_\varepsilon > 0$ be the maximal time of existence of this solution. The proof of Theorem 2 and Remark 3 show that, if

$$\frac{C_3}{\nu_h}\int_0^\tau \|\nabla_h u_\varepsilon(s)\|^2_{L^2} ds \big(\frac{\nu_h}{2} + \frac{1}{\nu_h}\|\partial_3 u_\varepsilon(0)\|^2_{L^2}\big) < 1,$$

then $T_\varepsilon > \tau$.
It is thus sufficient to show that, for $\eta > 0$ small enough, there exist a positive constant T_0 such that, for any $\varepsilon > 0$, the strong solution u_ε of (NS_ε) satisfies the inequality

$$\frac{C_3}{\nu_h}\int_0^{T_0} \|\nabla_h u_\varepsilon(s)\|^2_{L^2} ds \big(\frac{\nu_h}{2} + \frac{1}{\nu_h}\|\partial_3 u_\varepsilon(0)\|^2_{L^2}\big) < \frac{1}{2}. \tag{73}$$

Actually, the property (73) will be proved if we show that, for any positive number δ, there exist two positive numbers $T_0 = T_0(\delta)$ and $\eta_0 = \eta_0(\delta)$ such that

$$\int_0^{T_0} \|\nabla_h u_\varepsilon(s)\|^2_{L^2} ds \leq \delta. \tag{74}$$

The remaining part of the proof consists in showing Property (74).
Notice that Lemma 4 gives us an estimate of the quantity $\int_0^t \|\nabla_h u_\varepsilon(s)\|^2_{L^2} ds$, which we have used in the proofs of Theorems 1 and 2. Unfortunately, here the initial data $u_\varepsilon = v_0$ are not necessarily small. In order to prove Property (74), we write the solution u_ε as

$$u_\varepsilon = v_\varepsilon + z_\varepsilon,$$

where v_ε is the solution of the linear Stokes problem

$$(LS_\varepsilon)\begin{cases} \partial_t v_\varepsilon - \nu_h \Delta_h v_\varepsilon - \varepsilon \partial^2_{x_3} v_\varepsilon = -\nabla q_\varepsilon \text{ in } \tilde{Q},\ t > 0, \\ \operatorname{div} v_\varepsilon = 0 \ \text{ in } \tilde{Q},\ t > 0, \\ v_\varepsilon|_{\partial\Omega\times(-1,1)} = 0,\ t > 0, \\ v_\varepsilon(x_h, x_3) = v_\varepsilon(x_h, x_3 + 2),\ t > 0, \\ v_\varepsilon|_{t=0} = v_0, \end{cases}$$

and where z_ε is the solution of the following auxiliary nonlinear system

$$(Z_\varepsilon)\begin{cases}\partial_t z_\varepsilon + (z_\varepsilon + v_\varepsilon)\nabla(z_\varepsilon + v_\varepsilon) - \nu_h \Delta_h z_\varepsilon - \varepsilon \partial^2_{x_3} z_\varepsilon = -\nabla q^*_\varepsilon \text{ in } \tilde{Q},\ t > 0,\\ \operatorname{div} z_\varepsilon = 0 \ \text{ in } \tilde{Q},\ t > 0,\\ z_\varepsilon|_{\partial\Omega\times(-1,1)} = 0\ ,\ t > 0,\\ z_\varepsilon(x_h, x_3) = z_\varepsilon(x_h, x_3 + 2),\ t > 0,\\ z_\varepsilon|_{t=0} = 0.\end{cases}$$

The Stokes problem (LS_ε) admits a unique (global) classical solution v_ε in $C^0([0,+\infty),\tilde{V})$. Lemma 4 implies that, for any $t \geq 0$,

$$\|v_\varepsilon(t)\|^2_{L^2} + \nu_h \int_0^t \|\nabla_h v_\varepsilon(s)\|^2_{L^2} ds + \varepsilon \int_0^t \|\partial_3 v_\varepsilon(s)\|^2_{L^2} ds \leq \|v_0\|^2_{L^2}. \tag{75}$$

Arguing as in the proofs of Theorems 1 and 2, one at once shows that, for $t \geq 0$,

$$\|\partial_3 v_\varepsilon(t)\|^2_{L^2} + \nu_h \int_0^t \|\nabla_h \partial_3 v_\varepsilon(s)\|^2_{L^2} ds + \varepsilon \int_0^t \|\partial_3^2 v_\varepsilon(s)\|^2_{L^2} ds \leq \|\partial_3 v_0\|^2_{L^2}. \tag{76}$$

Notice that Problem (Z_ε) also admits a unique classical solution $z_\varepsilon \in C^0([0,T_\varepsilon),\tilde{V})$, where T_ε is the maximal time of existence of u_ε.

We will prove that, for $\eta > 0$ small enough, there exists $T_0 > 0$, independent of ε, but depending on U_0, such that,

$$\int_0^{T_0} \|\nabla_h v_\varepsilon(s)\|^2_{L^2} ds \leq \frac{\delta}{2}\ ,\quad \int_0^{T_0} \|\nabla_h z_\varepsilon(s)\|^2_{L^2} ds \leq \frac{\delta}{2}\ . \tag{77}$$

We introduce a positive number $\delta_0 \leq \delta$, which will be made more precise later. In order to prove the first inequality of (77), we proceed as follows by decomposing the linear Stokes problem (LS_ε) into two auxiliary linear systems, the first one with very regular initial data and the second one with small initial data. We recall that P is the classical Leray projector. Let A_0 be the Stokes operator $A_0 = -P\Delta$ with homogeneous Dirichlet boundary conditions on $\partial\Omega \times (-1,1)$ and periodic boundary conditions in the vertical variable. The spectrum of A_0 consists in a nondecreasing sequence of eigenvalues

$$0 < \lambda_0 < \lambda_1 \leq \lambda_2 \leq \cdots \leq \lambda_m \leq \cdots\ ,$$

going to infinity as m goes to infinity. We denote $\mathbb{P}_k$ the projection onto the space generated by the eigenfunctions associated to the first k eigenvalues of the operator A_0. There exists an integer $k_0 = k_0(\delta_0)$ such that,

$$\|(I - \mathbb{P}_k)\Sigma U_0\|^2_{L^2} \leq \frac{\delta_0 \nu_h}{16}\ , \forall k \geq k_0\ . \tag{78}$$

If $v_0 \in H^1_{0,per}(\tilde{Q})$ satisfies the condition (72), the property (78) implies that

$$\|(I-\mathbb{P}_{k_0})v_0\|_{L^2}^2 \leq 2\|(I-\mathbb{P}_{k_0})U_0\|_{L^2}^2 + 2\|(I-\mathbb{P}_{k_0})(U_0-v_0)\|_{L^2}^2 \leq \frac{\delta_0\nu_h}{8} + 2\eta^2 \ . \tag{79}$$

On the other hand, the following obvious estimate holds,

$$\|\mathbb{P}_{k_0}v_0\|_{H^1(\tilde{Q})}^2 \leq \lambda_{k_0+1}\|v_0\|_{L^2}^2 \leq \lambda_{k_0+1}(2\|U_0\|_{L^2}^2 + 2\eta^2) \ . \tag{80}$$

We next decompose v_ε into the sum $v_\varepsilon = v_{1,\varepsilon} + v_{2,\varepsilon}$ where $v_{1,\varepsilon}$ is the solution of the Stokes problem

$$(LS_{1,\varepsilon}) \begin{cases} \partial_t v_{1,\varepsilon} - \nu_h \Delta_h v_{1,\varepsilon} - \varepsilon \partial_{x_3}^2 v_{1,\varepsilon} = -\nabla q_{1,\varepsilon} \ \text{ in } \tilde{Q} \ , \ t>0, \\ \operatorname{div} v_{1,\varepsilon} = 0 \ \text{ in } \tilde{Q} \ , \ t>0, \\ v_{1,\varepsilon}|_{\partial\Omega\times(-1,1)} = 0 \ , \ t>0, \\ v_{1,\varepsilon}(x_h,x_3) = v_{1,\varepsilon}(x_h,x_3+2) \ , \ t>0, \\ v_{1,\varepsilon}|_{t=0} = \mathbb{P}_{k_0}v_0, \end{cases}$$

and $v_{2,\varepsilon}$ is the solution of the Stokes problem

$$(LS_{2,\varepsilon}) \begin{cases} \partial_t v_{2,\varepsilon} - \nu_h \Delta_h v_{2,\varepsilon} - \varepsilon \partial_{x_3}^2 v_{2,\varepsilon} = -\nabla q_{2,\varepsilon} \ \text{ in } \tilde{Q} \ , \ t>0, \\ \operatorname{div} v_{2,\varepsilon} = 0 \ \text{ in } \tilde{Q} \ , \ t>0, \\ v_{2,\varepsilon}|_{\partial\Omega\times(-1,1)} = 0 \ , \ t>0, \\ v_{2,\varepsilon}(x_h,x_3) = v_{2,\varepsilon}(x_h,x_3+2) \ , \ t>0, \\ v_{2,\varepsilon}|_{t=0} = (I-\mathbb{P}_{k_0})v_0. \end{cases}$$

From Lemma 4, we at once deduce that, for $t \geq 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|v_{2,\varepsilon}(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \nu_h \int_0^t \|\nabla_h v_{2,\varepsilon}(s)\|_{L^2}^2 ds + \varepsilon \int_0^t \|\partial_3 v_{2,\varepsilon}(s)\|_{L^2}^2 ds& \\ \leq \|(I-\mathbb{P}_{k_0})v_0\|_{L^2}^2 \leq \frac{\delta_0\nu_h}{8} + 2\eta^2&, \end{aligned} \tag{81}$$

Hence, if $\eta^2 \leq \delta_0\nu_h/16$, we obtain, for any $t \geq 0$,

$$\int_0^t \|\nabla_h v_{2,\varepsilon}(s)\|_{L^2}^2 ds \leq \frac{\delta_0}{8} + \frac{2\eta^2}{\nu_h} \leq \frac{\delta_0}{4}. \tag{82}$$

In order to get an upper bound of the term $\int_0^t \|\nabla_h v_{1,\varepsilon}(s)\|_{L^2}^2 ds$, we first estimate $\|\nabla_h v_{1,\varepsilon}(s)\|_{L^2}^2$ for any $s \geq 0$. Like in the proof of Proposition 2, we take the inner product in $L^2(\tilde{Q})^3$ of the first equation of $(LS_{1,\varepsilon})$ with $-P\Delta_h v_{1,\varepsilon}$. Arguing as in the proof of Proposition 2, we obtain, for any $t \geq 0$,

$$\partial_t \|\nabla_h v_{1,\varepsilon}\|_{L^2}^2 + \nu_h \|P\Delta_h v_{1,\varepsilon}\|_{L^2}^2 + 2\varepsilon \|\nabla_h \partial_3 v_{1,\varepsilon}\|_{L^2}^2 \leq 0.$$

Integrating the above inequality between 0 and t and taking into account the estimate (80), we obtain, for $t \geq 0$,

$$
\begin{aligned}
\|\nabla_h v_{1,\varepsilon}(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \nu_h \int_0^t \|P\Delta_h v_{1,\varepsilon}(s)\|_{L^2}^2 ds + 2\varepsilon \int_0^t \|\nabla_h \partial_3 v_{1,\varepsilon}(s)\|_{L^2}^2 ds \\
\leq \|\mathbb{P}_{k_0} v_0\|_{H^1(\tilde{Q})}^2 \leq \lambda_{k_0+1}(2\|U_0\|_{L^2}^2 + 2\eta^2).
\end{aligned}
$$

From the above inequality, we deduce that, for $t \geq 0$,

$$
\int_0^t \|\nabla_h v_{1,\varepsilon}(s)\|_{L^2}^2 ds \leq t\lambda_{k_0+1}(2\|U_0\|_{L^2}^2 + 2\eta^2) \leq t\lambda_{k_0+1}(2\|U_0\|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{\delta_0 \nu_h}{8}),
\tag{83}
$$

and thus, if

$$
0 < T_0 \leq \frac{\delta_0}{4\lambda_{k_0+1}}(2\|U_0\|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{\delta_0 \nu_h}{8})^{-1},
\tag{84}
$$

we have

$$
\int_0^{T_0} \|\nabla_h v_{1,\varepsilon}(s)\|_{L^2}^2 ds \leq \frac{\delta_0}{4}.
\tag{85}
$$

The inequalities (82) and (85) imply that, if $\eta^2 \leq \delta_0 \nu_h/16$ and if the condition (84) holds, then

$$
\int_0^{T_0} \|\nabla_h v_\varepsilon(s)\|_{L^2}^2 ds \leq \frac{\delta_0}{2} \leq \frac{\delta}{2}.
\tag{86}
$$

It remains to bound the integral $\int_0^{T_0} \|\nabla_h z_\varepsilon(s)\|_{L^2}^2 ds$. Taking the inner product in $L^2(\tilde{Q})^3$ of the first equation of System (Z_ε) with z_ε, we obtain the equality

$$
\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{2}\partial_t \|z_\varepsilon\|_{L^2}^2 + \nu_h \|\nabla_h z_\varepsilon\|_{L^2}^2 + \varepsilon \|\partial_3 z_\varepsilon\|_{L^2}^2 = &- (z_{\varepsilon,3}\partial_3 v_\varepsilon, z_\varepsilon) - (z_{\varepsilon,h}\nabla_h v_\varepsilon, z_\varepsilon) \\
&- (v_{\varepsilon,3}\partial_3 v_\varepsilon, z_\varepsilon) - (v_{\varepsilon,h}\nabla_h v_\varepsilon, z_\varepsilon)
\end{aligned}
\tag{87}
$$

We next estimate the four terms of the right-hand side member of the equality (87). Applying Lemma 2 and using the fact that $\partial_3 z_{\varepsilon,3} = -\mathrm{div}_h z_{\varepsilon,h}$, we obtain, for $0 \leq t \leq T_\varepsilon$,

$$
\begin{aligned}
|(z_{\varepsilon,3}\partial_3 v_\varepsilon, z_\varepsilon)| \leq &\|z_{\varepsilon,3}\|_{L_v^\infty(L_h^2)} \|\partial_3 v_\varepsilon\|_{L_v^2(L_h^4)} \|z_\varepsilon\|_{L_v^2(L_h^4)} \\
\leq &C_0^3 \big(\|z_{\varepsilon,3}\|_{L^2}^{1/2} \|\partial_3 z_{\varepsilon,3}\|_{L^2}^{1/2} + \|z_{\varepsilon,3}\|_{L^2}\big) \\
&\times \|\partial_3 v_\varepsilon\|_{L^2}^{1/2} \|\partial_3 \nabla_h v_\varepsilon\|_{L^2}^{1/2} \|z_\varepsilon\|_{L^2}^{1/2} \|\nabla_h z_\varepsilon\|_{L^2}^{1/2} \\
\leq &C_0^3 \big(\|z_{\varepsilon,3}\|_{L^2}^{1/2} \|\nabla_h z_{\varepsilon,h}\|_{L^2}^{1/2} + \|z_{\varepsilon,3}\|_{L^2}\big) \\
&\times \|\partial_3 v_\varepsilon\|_{L^2}^{1/2} \|\partial_3 \nabla_h v_\varepsilon\|_{L^2}^{1/2} \|z_\varepsilon\|_{L^2}^{1/2} \|\nabla_h z_\varepsilon\|_{L^2}^{1/2}.
\end{aligned}
$$

Applying the Young inequality to the above estimate, we get the inequality

$$
\begin{aligned}
|(z_{\varepsilon,3}\partial_3 v_\varepsilon, z_\varepsilon)| \leq &\frac{\nu_h}{8} \|\nabla_h z_\varepsilon\|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{4C_0^6}{\nu_h} \|\partial_3 v_\varepsilon\|_{L^2} \|\partial_3 \nabla_h v_\varepsilon\|_{L^2} \|z_\varepsilon\|_{L^2}^2 \\
&+ \frac{3C_0^4}{2\nu_h^{1/3}} \|\partial_3 v_\varepsilon\|_{L^2}^{2/3} \|\partial_3 \nabla_h v_\varepsilon\|_{L^2}^{2/3} \|z_\varepsilon\|_{L^2}^2.
\end{aligned}
\tag{88}
$$

Applying Lemma 2 and the Young inequality again, we also obtain the following estimate, for $0 \leq t \leq T_\varepsilon$,

$$\begin{aligned}
|(z_{\varepsilon,h}\nabla_h v_\varepsilon, z_\varepsilon)| \leq{}& C_0^2 \|\nabla_h v_\varepsilon\|_{L^\infty_v(L^2_h)} \|\nabla_h z_\varepsilon\|_{L^2} \|z_\varepsilon\|_{L^2} \\
&\leq C_0^3 \Big(\|\nabla_h v_\varepsilon\|_{L^2}^{1/2} \|\nabla_h \partial_3 v_\varepsilon\|_{L^2}^{1/2} + \|\nabla_h v_\varepsilon\|_{L^2} \Big) \|\nabla_h z_\varepsilon\|_{L^2} \|z_\varepsilon\|_{L^2} \\
&\leq \frac{\nu_h}{8} \|\nabla_h z_\varepsilon\|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{C_0^6}{\nu_h} \|z_\varepsilon\|_{L^2}^2 \Big(9 \|\nabla_h v_\varepsilon\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\nabla_h \partial_3 v_\varepsilon\|_{L^2}^2 \Big).
\end{aligned} \tag{89}$$

Applying Lemma 2 again, we can write, for $0 \leq t \leq T_\varepsilon$,

$$\begin{aligned}
|(v_{\varepsilon,3}\partial_3 v_\varepsilon, z_\varepsilon)| &\leq \|v_{\varepsilon,3}\|_{L^\infty_v(L^2_h)} \|\partial_3 v_\varepsilon\|_{L^2_v(L^4_h)} \|z_\varepsilon\|_{L^2_v(L^4_h)} \\
&\leq C_0^3 \big(\|v_{\varepsilon,3}\|_{L^2}^{1/2} \|\partial_3 v_{\varepsilon,3}\|_{L^2}^{1/2} + \|v_{\varepsilon,3}\|_{L^2} \big) \\
&\quad \times \|\partial_3 v_\varepsilon\|_{L^2}^{1/2} \|\partial_3 \nabla_h v_\varepsilon\|_{L^2}^{1/2} \|z_\varepsilon\|_{L^2}^{1/2} \|\nabla_h z_\varepsilon\|_{L^2}^{1/2}.
\end{aligned}$$

Using the Young inequality several times, we deduce from the above estimate that

$$\begin{aligned}
&|(v_{\varepsilon,3}\partial_3 v_\varepsilon, z_\varepsilon)| \\
&\quad \leq \frac{3C_0^4}{2\nu_h^{1/3}} \Big(\|v_\varepsilon\|_{L^2}^{2/3} \|\partial_3 v_\varepsilon\|_{L^2}^{2/3} + \|v_\varepsilon\|_{L^2}^{4/3} \Big) \|\partial_3 v_\varepsilon\|_{L^2}^{2/3} \|\partial_3 \nabla_h v_\varepsilon\|_{L^2}^{2/3} \|z_\varepsilon\|_{L^2}^{2/3} \\
&\qquad + \frac{\nu_h}{8} \|\nabla_h z_\varepsilon\|_{L^2}^2,
\end{aligned}$$

and thus that

$$\begin{aligned}
|(v_{\varepsilon,3}\partial_3 v_\varepsilon, z_\varepsilon)| \leq{}& \frac{\nu_h}{8} \|\nabla_h z_\varepsilon\|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{C_0^4}{\nu_h} \|\partial_3 \nabla_h v_\varepsilon\|_{L^2}^2 \|z_\varepsilon\|_{L^2}^2 + C_0^4 \|v_\varepsilon\|_{L^2}^2 \|\partial_3 v_\varepsilon\|_{L^2} \\
&+ C_0^4 \|v_\varepsilon\|_{L^2} \|\partial_3 v_\varepsilon\|_{L^2}^2.
\end{aligned} \tag{90}$$

Finally, arguing as above by applying Lemma 2 and the Young inequality, we get the estimate

$$\begin{aligned}
|(v_{\varepsilon,h}\nabla_h v_\varepsilon, z_\varepsilon)| &\leq C_0^2 \|\nabla_h v_\varepsilon\|_{L^\infty_v(L^2_h)} \|\nabla_h v_\varepsilon\|_{L^2}^{1/2} \|v_\varepsilon\|_{L^2}^{1/2} \|\nabla_h z_\varepsilon\|_{L^2}^{1/2} \|z_\varepsilon\|_{L^2}^{1/2} \\
&\leq C_0^3 \Big(\|\nabla_h v_\varepsilon\|_{L^2}^{1/2} \|\nabla_h \partial_3 v_\varepsilon\|_{L^2}^{1/2} + \|\nabla_h v_\varepsilon\|_{L^2} \Big) \\
&\quad \times \|\nabla_h v_\varepsilon\|_{L^2}^{1/2} \|v_\varepsilon\|_{L^2}^{1/2} \|\nabla_h z_\varepsilon\|_{L^2}^{1/2} \|z_\varepsilon\|_{L^2}^{1/2} \\
&\leq \frac{\nu_h}{8} \|\nabla_h z_\varepsilon\|_{L^2}^2 + 2C_0^4 \|\nabla_h v_\varepsilon\|_{L^2}^2 \|v_\varepsilon\|_{L^2} \\
&\quad + \frac{C_0^4}{2\nu_h} \|z_\varepsilon\|_{L^2}^2 \Big(\|\nabla_h v_\varepsilon\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\nabla_h \partial_3 v_\varepsilon\|_{L^2}^2 \Big).
\end{aligned} \tag{91}$$

Integrating the equality (87) from 0 to t, taking into account the estimates (88) to (91) and, applying Gronwall lemma yield, for $0 \leq t \leq T_\varepsilon$,

$$\begin{aligned}\|z_\varepsilon(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \nu_h \int_0^t \|\nabla_h z_\varepsilon(s)\|_{L^2}^2 ds + 2\varepsilon \int_0^t \|\partial_3 z_\varepsilon(s)\|_{L^2}^2 ds \\ \leq \int_0^t B_1(s) \|z_\varepsilon(s)\|_{L^2}^2 ds + \int_0^t B_2(s) ds,\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\|z_\varepsilon(t)\|_{L^2}^2 + \nu_h \int_0^t \|\nabla_h z_\varepsilon(s)\|_{L^2}^2 ds \leq 2 \int_0^t B_2(s) ds \left(\exp 2 \int_0^t B_1(s) ds\right), \tag{92}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} B_1(s) =& 2\Big[\frac{C_0^4}{\nu_h}(3C_0^2+2)\|\nabla_h \partial_3 v_\varepsilon(s)\|_{L^2}^2 + \frac{C_0^4}{2\nu_h}(18C_0^2+1)\|\nabla_h v_\varepsilon(s)\|_{L^2}^2 \\ &+ \frac{2C_0^6}{\nu_h}\|\partial_3 v_\varepsilon(s)\|_{L^2}^2 + C_0^4 \|\partial_3 v_\varepsilon(s)\|_{L^2} \\ B_2(s) =& 2C_0^4 \Big(\|v_\varepsilon(s)\|_{L^2}^2 \|\partial_3 v_\varepsilon(s)\|_{L^2} + \|v_\varepsilon(s)\|_{L^2} \|\partial_3 v_\varepsilon(s)\|_{L^2}^2 \\ &+ 2\|v_\varepsilon(s)\|_{L^2} \|\nabla_h v_\varepsilon(s)\|_{L^2}^2\Big). \end{aligned} \tag{93}$$

The inequalities (92) and (93) and the estimates (75), (76), and (86) imply that, for $0 \leq t \leq T_\varepsilon$,

$$\begin{aligned}\int_0^t \|\nabla_h z_\varepsilon(s)\|_{L^2}^2 ds \leq & \frac{c_1}{\nu_h}\|v_0\|_{L^2}\Big(t\|v_0\|_{L^2}\|\partial_3 v_0\|_{L^2} + t\|\partial_3 v_0\|_{L^2}^2 + \delta_0\Big) \\ & \times \exp c_2 \Big(t\|\partial_3 v_0\|_{L^2} + \nu_h^{-1}\|\partial_3 v_0\|_{L^2}^2 (t + \nu_h^{-1}) + \nu_h^{-1}\delta_0\Big),\end{aligned} \tag{94}$$

where c_1 and c_2 are two positive constants independent of v_0 and ε. Since

$$\|v_0\|_{H^{0,1}(\tilde{Q})} \leq \|\Sigma U_0\|_{H^{0,1}(\tilde{Q})} + \eta \leq \|\Sigma U_0\|_{H^{0,1}(\tilde{Q})} + \frac{(\delta_0 \nu_h)^{1/2}}{4},$$

the inequality (94) shows that we can choose $\delta_0 > 0$ and $T_0 > 0$ independent of ε and v_0 such that

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{c_1}{\nu_h}\|v_0\|_{L^2}\Big(T_0\|v_0\|_{L^2}\|\partial_3 v_0\|_{L^2} + T_0\|\partial_3 v_0\|_{L^2}^2 + \delta_0\Big) \\ &\qquad \times \exp c_2 \Big(T_0\|\partial_3 v_0\|_{L^2} + \nu_h^{-1}\|\partial_3 v_0\|_{L^2}^2 (T_0 + \nu_h^{-1}) + \nu_h^{-1}\delta_0\Big) \leq \frac{\delta}{2}.\end{aligned} \tag{95}$$

As we have explained at the beginning of the proof, the properties (94) and (95) imply that the maximal time T_ε of existence of z_ε and of u_ε is larger than T_0 and that

$$\int_0^{T_0} \|\nabla_h z_\varepsilon(s)\|_{L^2}^2 ds \leq \frac{\delta}{2}.$$

Thus the inequalities (77) are proved, which concludes the proof of the theorem.

Remark 4. We notice that the classical approach to show the local in time existence result for large initial data, consisting in the decompostion of the problem into a large data linear problem and a small data, perturbed nonlinear problem, does not work here, since we cannot prove that, for initial data U_0 in $\widetilde{H}^{0,1}(Q)$, the quantity $\|(I - \mathbb{P}_{k_0})v_0\|_{H^{0,1}(\tilde{Q})}$ is small. In the above proof, the decomposition of the linear system into two systems, one with smooth initial data $\mathbb{P}_{k_0}v_0$ and the other one with small initial data $(I - \mathbb{P}_{k_0})v_0$ avoids this difficulty. Indeed, in the estimates (81) and (82), we only need to know that $\|(I - \mathbb{P}_{k_0})v_0\|_{L^2(\tilde{Q})}$ is small.

References

1. J.-Y. Chemin, B. Desjardins, I. Gallagher and E. Grenier, Fluids with anisotropic viscosity, Special issue for R. Temam's 60th birthday, *M2AN. Mathematical Modelling and Numerical Analysis*, **34**, no. 2, 2000, p. 315-335.
2. J.-Y. Chemin, B. Desjardins, I. Gallagher and E. Grenier, Mathematical Geophysics: An introduction to rotating fluids and to the Navier-Stokes equations, *Oxford University Press*, 2006.
3. J.-Y. Chemin and P. Zhang, On the global wellposedness to the 3-D incompressible anisotropic Navier-Stokes equations, *Commun. Math. Phys.*, **272**, 2007, p. 529-566.
4. P. Constantin and C. Foiaş, Navier-Stokes equations, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1988.
5. H. Fujita and T. Kato, On the Navier-Stokes initial value problem I, *Arch. for Rational Mechanics and Analysis*, **16**, 1964, p. 269-315.
6. E. Grenier and N. Masmoudi, Ekman layers of rotating fluids, the case of well prepared initial data, *Commun. in Partial Differential Equations*, **22**, 1997, p. 953-975.
7. D. Iftimie, The resolution of the Navier-Stokes equations in anisotropic spaces, *Revista Matemática iberoamericana*, **15**, 1999, p.1-36.
8. D. Iftimie, A uniqueness result for the Navier-Stokes equations with vanishing vertical viscosity, *SIAM Journal on Mathematical Analysis*, **33**, 2002, no. 6, p. 1483-1493.
9. D. Iftimie and G. Planas, *Inviscid limits for the Navier-Stokes equations with Navier friction boundary conditions*, Nonlinearity, **19** (2006), p. 899-918.
10. J. Leray, *Essai sur le mouvement d'un liquide visqueux emplissant l'espace*, Acta Matematica, **63**, 1933, p. 193-248.
11. M. Paicu, *Étude asymptotique pour les fluides anisotropes en rotation rapide dans le cas périodique*, Journal de Mathématiques Pures et Appliquées, **83**, no. 2, 2004, p. 163-242.
12. M. Paicu, *Équation périodique de Navier-Stokes sans viscosité dans une direction*, Communications in Partial Differential Equations, **30**, 2005, no. 7-9, p. 1107-1140.
13. M. Paicu, *Équation anisotrope de Navier-Stokes dans des espaces critiques*, Revista Matemática Iberoamericana, **21**, 2005, no. 1, p. 179-235.
14. J. Pedlovsky, *Geophysical fluid dynamics*, Springer-Verlag, (1979).
   thin 3D domains.
   3D domains III:

15. V. A. Solonnikov and V. E. Ščadilov, *On a boundary value problem for a stationary system of Navier-Stokes equations*, Trudy Mat. Inst. Steklov, **125** (1973), p. 186-199.
16. G.I. Taylor, *Experiments on the motion of solid bodies in rotating fluids*, Proc. Roy. Soc. A **104** (1923), p. 213-218.
17. R. Temam, *Navier-Stokes Equations*, Revised Edition, Studies in mathematics and its Applications 2, North-Holland, 1979.